

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACTORS RELATED TO INTER-SCHOOL MOBILITY AMONG CERTIFICATED
TEACHERS IN NEWFOUNDLAND

by

JOHN HOWARD LUNDRIGAN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JULY, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Factors Related To Inter-School Mobility Among Certificated Teachers in Newfoundland" submitted by John Howard Lundrigan in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to identify factors which correlate with mobility among certificated teachers in the province of Newfoundland. Data collected by questionnaire from 123 teachers who had moved from their 1964-1965 teaching positions to other schools for the school year 1965-1966, provided the necessary information used in the testing of the various hypotheses.

Eighty-two factors, identified mainly from related research, were used in the questionnaire. These were classified under nine headings as follows: (1) Administrative Factors, (2) Community Factors, (3) Economic Factors, (4) Personal Factors, (5) Pupil Factors, (6) Religious Factors, (7) School Board Factors, (8) Training and Professional Factors, and (9) Working Conditions. Teachers were required to respond to each individual factor according to the influence it had on their decision to leave their former schools. The response scale for each factor was D, M, S, and N, corresponding respectively to 'decided', 'moderate', 'slight', or 'no influence'. Personal data such as the sex, age, experience, and training of respondents assisted in establishing a composite picture of the typically mobile teacher.

Results of the analysis of data for the total sample revealed that several Personal Factors ranked highest when compared with other factors. However, factors related to Working Conditions were frequently identified by respondents as major contributors to their mobility. Community, Pupil, and Economic Factors were also among the frequently identified areas

related to mobility. Generally, School Board, Religious, and Training and Professional Factors ranked relatively low when compared with the other factors on the questionnaire.

Respondents were classified and compared on the basis of certain selected variables such as sex, years of professional preparation, years of teaching experience, school system, school size, and community size. Based on findings using 't' tests and analyses of covariance, it was concluded that teachers, when compared on all these variables, differed significantly in their responses to individual factors in terms of the influence that these factors had on their mobility.

The general conclusions from this study were that: (1) teachers did identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors; and (2) teachers, when compared on certain selected variables, differed in their responses to individual factors, regarding the effect that these factors had on their decisions to move from their former schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the interest, encouragement, and competent guidance offered by Dr. E. W. Ratsoy, the supervisor of this study. Thanks are also extended to Dr. D. A. MacKay and Dr. R. R. Rath, the other members of the thesis committee.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Phillip Warren, Mr. Frederick Kirby, and the Superintendents of the Department of Education in Newfoundland for furnishing certain necessary data. A special word of thanks is expressed to the principals and teachers throughout the province of Newfoundland who gave of their valuable time in order to respond to the questionnaire used in connection with this thesis.

To James Carlson, who assisted in developing the necessary programs used in computer analyses, a word of thanks is expressed.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his deep appreciation to his wife for the encouragement offered and the clerical assistance rendered while this study was being conducted and while the manuscript was being prepared.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Statement of the problem	2
Significance of the study	3
Statement of hypotheses	6
Definitions of Terms Used	7
Delimitations	9
Assumptions	10
Limitations	10
References for Chapter I	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Dissatisfaction and Mobility	13
Factors Related to Dissatisfaction	16
Factors Related to Mobility	20
Summary	26
References for Chapter II	29
III. METHOD OF COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA	31
The Questionnaire	31
The Sample and Distribution of Questionnaires	32
Treatment of Data	35
Testing of Hypotheses	37

CHAPTER

PAGE

References for Chapter III	40
IV. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF	
RESPONDENTS	41
Marital Status, Sex, and Age	41
Annual Salary	45
Teaching Experience and Professional Preparation	45
Community, Type of School, and School Systems	48
School Size, Grades Taught, and Position Held	54
Summary of Chapter IV	57
References for Chapter IV	62
V. AN ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	
AND GROUPS OF FACTORS	63
Hypothesis 1.1	63
Findings	64
Discussion	67
Hypothesis 1.2	73
Findings	74
Discussion	76
Summary and conclusions.	88
References for Chapter V	89
VI. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS	
CLASSIFIED BY PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS,	
SCHOOL SYSTEMS, SCHOOL SIZE, AND COMMUNITY SIZE	90
Differences Between Respondents Classified by Personal	

CHAPTER

PAGE

and Professional Characteristics	91
Hypothesis 2.1	91
Findings	91
Discussion	93
Hypothesis 2.2	94
Findings	94
Discussion	96
Hypothesis 2.3	98
Findings	98
Discussion	98
Summary and conclusions	101
Differences Between Respondents Classified by School	
System	102
Findings	103
Discussion	103
Conclusion	105
Differences Between Respondents Classified by Size of	
School	105
Findings	106
Discussion	106
Conclusion	106
Differences Between Respondents Classified by Size of	
Community	109
Findings	109

CHAPTER	PAGE
Discussion	109
Conclusion	111
Summary	111
References for Chapter VI	114
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	115
Summary of the Study	115
The problem	115
Instrumentation and methodology	116
The sample	117
Results	117
Conclusions and Implications	120
Reference for Chapter VII	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY	129
APPENDICES	135

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Teacher Mobility Population and Related Sample by Sex and School System.	34
II. Tabulation of Survey Returns	36
III. Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status	42
IV. Distribution of Respondents by Sex and Age	44
V. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by Annual Salary	46
VI. Distribution of Respondents by Teaching Experience	47
VII. Distribution of Respondents by Professional Preparation.	49
VIII. Distribution of Respondents by Size of Community for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966	50
IX. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by the Type of School	52
X. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by Type of School System	53
XI. A Matrix of Inter-System and Intra-System Mobility of Respondents from 1964-1965 to 1965-1966	55
XII. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by Size of School	56
XIII. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by Number of Grades Taught	58
XIV. Distribution of Respondents for the School Years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 by Position Held	59
XV. The Composite Teacher	61
XVI. Distribution of Individual Factors by Size of Means	65
XVII. Distribution of Groups of Factors by Size of Means	75
XVIII. Distribution of Personal and Family Factors by Size of Means	77

TABLE	PAGE
XIX. Distribution of Pupil Factors by Size of Means	78
XX. Distribution of Community Factors by Size of Means . . .	80
XXI. Distribution of Economic Factors by Size of Means . . .	81
XXII. Distribution of Factors Related to Working Conditions by Size of Means	82
XXIII. Distribution of Administrative Factors by Size of Means.	84
XXIV. Distribution of School Board Factors by Size of Means .	85
XXV. Distribution of Training and Professional Factors by Size of Means	86
XXVI. Distribution of Religious Factors by Size of Means . . .	87
XXVII. Factors With Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by Sex	92
XXVIII. Factors with Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by Years of Professional Preparation	95
XXIX. Factors With Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by Years of Teaching Experience	99
XXX. Factors With Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by School System	104
XXXI. Factors With Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by School Size	107
XXXII. Factors With Significant Differences Between the Means of Respondents Classified by Population of 1964-1965 School Community	110
XXXIII. Tests of Differences Between Factor Means of Respondents Classified by Sex	151
XXXIV. Tests of Differences Between Factor Means of Respondents Classified by Years of Professional Preparation	153

TABLE	PAGE
XXXV. Tests of Differences Between Factor Means of Respondents Classified by Years of Teaching Experience	155
XXXVI. Tests of Differences Among Factor Means of Respondents Classified by School Systems	157
XXXVII. Tests of Differences Between Factor Means of Respondents Classified by School Size	159
XXXVIII. Tests of Differences Between Factor Means of Respondents Classified by Population	161

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

Throughout North America in recent decades a number of studies have been conducted by local boards of education, central offices, and individual researchers, in an effort to ascertain the underlying causes of teacher mobility within and between school systems, provinces, and states. The general impression is that excessive mobility in most cases is a problem and that an effort should be made to resolve it.

Many statements have been made by laymen and educators regarding the disadvantages inherent in excessive teacher mobility in terms of the school program, pupil achievement, teacher orientation, and, in general, the total productivity of the school. Fisher stated that:

With inservice training programs for teachers becoming more prevalent throughout the nation, it is a financial waste to a district if it does not reap the benefits from such training through better classroom instruction. The continuity of a program suffers when turnover is high. Quality in a classroom is not usually achieved in a year or two. A district known as a training ground because of high turnover has children who are being shortchanged in educational opportunities.¹

Low salaries, administrative problems, community factors, professional needs, personal and family factors, and pupil characteristics are frequently given as major determinants of teacher mobility. A review of the literature related to mobility reveals that these factors are

¹D. D. Fisher, "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Journal, XL (January, 1963), p. 374.

present in most systems in varying degrees. Also, the degree of mobility varies significantly from area to area. For example, in a report on the incidence of teacher mobility in the United States, it was shown that a spread of from twelve to twenty-seven per cent mobility existed, with Dallas, Texas having twelve per cent mobility, Syracuse, New York sixteen per cent, and Urbana, Illinois twenty-seven per cent.²

Based on the evidence that the factors related to teacher mobility and also the incidence of mobility vary from area to area, it might be logically deduced that there is a relationship between the two.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The general purpose of this study was to investigate the causes of teacher mobility in the province of Newfoundland. More specifically, the problem was to ascertain the extent to which certain identified factors correlate with mobility among certificated teachers in Newfoundland.

The sub-problems, stated as questions, are:

1. What are the personal characteristics associated with teachers who move?
2. Will certain factors be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors?
3. Will certain groups of factors be identified by respondents

²Ibid., p. 274.

as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other groups of factors?

4. Do teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ in their responses to identified factors?

5. Do teachers classified on the basis of the school system from which they moved differ in their responses to identified factors?

6. Do teachers classified on the basis of the number of teachers in the school from which they moved differ in their responses to identified factors?

7. Do teachers classified on the basis of the size of community from which they moved differ in their responses to identified factors?

Significance of the Study

In an article in The Manitoba Teacher, October, 1965, Howard J. Loewen, in prefacing a survey to be made by the Manitoba Teachers' Society, urged that what is needed by those responsible for staffing the schools is an effort to eliminate the many irritations that are producing the present state of restlessness within the profession.³ This remark is in tune with the lamentations of the report of the Manitoba Teachers' Society survey of teacher mobility, which viewed with concern the situation in which a record number of teachers have left teaching in Manitoba in 1965.

³Howard J. Loewen (ed.), "Teacher Supply," The Manitoba Teacher, XLIV (September-October, 1965), p. 3.

The identification of teacher mobility as a problem which needs solving is by no means a new notion. In 1957 Phillips stated that:

Despite the significance of teacher mobility, information about teachers who change positions or leave the profession is inadequate. The available data do not answer such questions as: how many teachers leave? where do they go? why do they go? what are they like? etc.. We need these answers in order to assess more fully the impact of teacher mobility on the profession. This will help us devise more intelligent recruitment methods. This will tell us more about holding the people we already have.⁴

Bruce contended that of all the problems that boards of education have to contend with, the turnover problem of teachers is probably the most troublesome and most confusing.⁵ Fisher, too, concurred with this point of view, and stated that when there is a high percentage of mobility, it is often due to unsatisfactory working conditions.⁶

The Deputy Minister of Education for Newfoundland, in talking about teacher supply, deliberated as follows:

Even if we solve the problem of supply we will still be faced with the greater problem of teacher tenure. The skills required to teach the elementary grade children are mastered only after years of experience, and it is a known fact that the more experienced and better qualified teachers gravitate to the larger centers of population leaving the children of the smaller and isolated settlements to be taught by the untrained and inexperienced. This is part of the explanation of the disproportionate number of Grade IX failures

⁴B. N. Phillips, E. Bonk, and J. R. Mitchell, "Can We Reduce Teacher Turnover?", Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (April, 1957), p. 272.

⁵William C. Bruce, "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), p. 29.

⁶Fisher, loc. cit.

in our smaller schools.⁷

Although the term tenure above referred to keeping teachers in the profession, Hanley nevertheless visualized gravitation of teachers to the larger areas as constituting a problem.

A recent release by the Royal Commission on Education and Youth reported from its hearings in southern Newfoundland that:

While the smaller isolated settlements were experiencing difficulty in finding teachers with one or more years' training, the larger towns were disturbed because of the high rate of teacher turnover.⁸

The extent of mobility in Newfoundland was reviewed for the years 1957-1960 in a Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. It was pointed out that for the school year 1957-1958, 20 per cent of the certificated teachers changed teaching jobs in the province. For 1958-1959 this increased to 21.5 per cent, and for 1959-1960 to 22 per cent. If one were to include the licensed teachers, who compose approximately one third of the Newfoundland teaching force, the overall percentage of mobility for each of the school years from 1957 to 1960 would be in excess of 30 per cent.⁹

The percentages of mobility for Newfoundland are very high when compared with the overall average for the United States, which is

⁷P. J. Hanley, Annual Report--Newfoundland Department of Education (St. John's: Creative Printers, 1964), p. 12.

⁸Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter, XVII (December, 1965).

⁹Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter, XV (May, 1964).

estimated to be 14 per cent.¹⁰ Viewing Alberta, it was reported in the Royal Commission Report that for the year 1956, 11.5 per cent of the Alberta teaching force moved within Alberta and 4.5 per cent moved out of the province.¹¹ English reported that for British Columbia the annual turnover is about 15 per cent.¹²

The statistics presented above demonstrate the disproportionate incidence of mobility in the Newfoundland school system as compared with certain Canadian provinces and the United States in general.

In summary, an attempt was made to show that excessive teacher mobility is generally considered a problem, and that the incidence of mobility in Newfoundland is quite high. A study of the reasons related to this excessive mobility could potentially reveal areas in which constructive recommendations might be made.

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are presented for this study:

Hypothesis 1: Teachers will identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors.

1.1: Certain factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors.

¹⁰W. W. Charters, "The Relation of Morale to Turnover Among Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, II (May, 1965), pp. 163-173.

¹¹S. A. Lindstedt, "The Alberta Teaching Force in 1957-1958--A Summary," Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, (Edmonton: November, 1959), p. 341.

¹²J. English, "Current Methods of Recruiting and Retaining Teachers," Canadian Education, VI (Fall, 1950), p. 90.

- 1.2: Certain groups of factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other groups of factors.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

- 2.1: Teachers classified on the basis of sex differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

- 2.2: Teachers classified on the basis of years of professional preparation differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

- 2.3: Teachers classified on the basis of years of teaching experience differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Hypothesis 3: Teachers classified on the basis of the school system from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Hypothesis 4: Teachers classified on the basis of the number of teachers in the school from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Hypothesis 5: Teachers classified on the basis of the size of the community from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Amalgamated schools. These are schools operated by a board made up of members chosen from two or more of the major denominations in Newfoundland. These schools are financed in the same manner as the denominational schools.

Central high schools. The Newfoundland Department of Education defines these schools as those which have been established within an area and in a building separate from other schools, for the express

purpose of accommodating all pupils in grades beyond a designated grade not lower than Grade VI.¹³

Certificated teachers. These are persons who have completed at least one year of university training, and have been awarded a certificate to teach by the Newfoundland Department of Education.

Denominational schools. These are schools which are state supported for organizational and administrative purposes, but which are placed under the jurisdiction of a particular denomination. They have been described by the former Minister of Education for Newfoundland as public schools operating within a denominational framework.¹⁴

Licensed teachers. These are persons who have not completed one full year of university training, but have been awarded a license to teach in Newfoundland by the Department of Education.

Mobility. For the purpose of this study this term refers to the movement of certificated teachers from the school in which they were teaching in Newfoundland in the school year 1964-1965, to another school in the same province in 1965-1966.

¹³Department of Education Newfoundland, Education Regulations (Remuneration of Teachers and Grants to Boards--Amendment), 1959, Section 2, Item (1).

¹⁴A. Frecker, Education in the Atlantic Provinces (Toronto: Gage and Company Limited, 1957), p. 61.

Regional high schools. These are schools which have been established within an area and in a building separate from other schools, for the express purpose of accommodating all pupils in grades beyond a designated grade not lower than Grade IX.¹⁵

School systems. This term refers to the five denominational systems, namely Anglican, Pentecostal, Roman Catholic, Salvation Army, and United Church, and a sixth, the Amalgamated system operating throughout the province of Newfoundland.

IV. DELIMITATIONS

This study attempts to identify the extent to which certain selected factors correlate with mobility among certificated teachers in Newfoundland. More specifically, the sample involves only certificated teachers who taught in Newfoundland in the school year 1964-1965, but were teaching in a different school in the same province during the school year 1965-1966. This delimitation has two features which need elaboration. Firstly, only certificated teachers are included in the study, thus eliminating the licensed staff. The aim of the Newfoundland government is to have all teachers certificated. The extent to which this aim is being accomplished may be demonstrated by considering the fact that in the school year 1958-1959, of the 3,894 teachers in Newfoundland, 1,958, or over 50 per cent were licensed.¹⁶ However, in

¹⁵Department of Education Newfoundland, loc. cit.

¹⁶Annual Report of the Department of Education (St. John's, Newfoundland: Guardian Press, 1960).

the school year 1964-1965, 69.5 per cent of the Newfoundland teaching force was certificated.¹⁷ Consequently, it is felt that the licensed staff will not represent a significant segment of the Newfoundland teaching force for many years beyond 1965-1966, and will therefore be excluded from the study.

Secondly, only certificated teachers who were teaching in Newfoundland in the school year 1964-1965 are included. This restriction is aimed at eliminating from the study persons who had been teaching in Newfoundland prior to the school year 1964-1965, but who, for certain reasons (example: returned to university, family reasons, etc.), were not teaching in the school year 1964-1965. It is felt that if such staff returned to teaching in different schools in the school year 1965-1966, it may not have been the result of a deliberate choice on their part, but rather there may have been no vacancy in their former school.

V. ASSUMPTIONS

It is assumed that:

1. The instrument used in this study is adequate for measuring the causes of teacher mobility in Newfoundland.
2. The responses to the instrument are valid.

VI. LIMITATIONS

1. Since this study is not concerned with mobility among

¹⁷Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter, XVI (May, 1965).

licensed teachers in Newfoundland, therefore, this restricts the degree to which generalizations could be made regarding mobility among all Newfoundland teachers.

2. No attempt will be made to investigate the causes of teacher movement out of the province. This restricts the extent to which generalizations may be made regarding the whole problem of teacher mobility associated with the province of Newfoundland.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

1. Annual Report of the Department of Education. St. John's, Newfoundland: Guardian Press, 1960.
2. Bruce, William C. "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), 29.
3. Charters, W. W. "The Relation of Morale to Turnover Among Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, II (May, 1965), 163-173.
4. Department of Education Newfoundland. Education Regulations (Remuneration of Teachers and Grants to Boards--Amendment), 1959, Section 2, Item (1).
5. English, J. "Current Methods of Recruiting and Retaining Teachers," Canadian Education, VI (Fall, 1950), 90.
6. Fisher, D. D. "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Journal, XL (January, 1963), 374.
7. Frecker, A. Education in the Atlantic Provinces. Toronto: Gage and Company Limited, 1957.
8. Hanley, P. J. Annual Report--Newfoundland Department of Education. St. John's: Creative Printers, 1964.
9. Lindstedt, S. A. "The Alberta Teaching Force in 1958-1959--a Summary," Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, Edmonton: November, 1959, 341.
10. Loewen, Howard J. (ed.). "Teacher Supply," The Manitoba Teacher, XLIV (September-October, 1965), 3.
11. Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XV (May, 1964).
12. Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XVI (May, 1965).
13. Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XVII (December, 1965).
14. Phillips, B. N., E. Bonk, and J. R. Mitchell. "Can We Reduce Teacher Turnover?", Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (April, 1957), 272.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into four major sections, as follows:

I. This section presents literature related to job dissatisfaction and lack of needs satisfaction, and the implications for mobility.

II. From empirical studies, factors related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction are identified.

III. This section presents a resumé of factors related to teacher mobility which have been identified in various studies.

IV. A summary of the salient causes of teacher mobility concludes the chapter.

I. DISSATISFACTION AND MOBILITY

Maslow theorized that individuals have a hierarchical structure of needs, and that the lower order needs (physiological and safety needs) must be met before the higher order needs (social needs, esteem needs, and self-fulfillment needs) can be met.¹ This suggests that in the teaching organization where the physiological needs (food, clothing, and shelter) are not met, the top hierarchical needs (for creativity, to do well, etc.) will not be met. On the basis of this theory Blai

¹A. H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (Harper and Brothers: New York, 1954), pp. 80-106.

hypothesized that there was a relationship between needs satisfaction and job satisfaction. Specifically, Blai claimed that:

Job satisfaction varies with the extent to which human needs are satisfied by the occupation; the greater the needs satisfaction, the greater the job satisfaction.²

Blai's hypothesis was supported. To be more explicit, he found that the relationship between need and job satisfaction was a Pearson 'r' of +.58.³

Anderson is among the many writers who have recommended that very serious attention be given to the selection and retention of teachers. The author's concern with retention grew out of a study related to teacher morale and pupil achievement. He discovered that there was a significant positive relationship between the two. Thus, it was found that if teacher morale was high, student achievement was also high. The study made no attempt to show which variable affected which.⁴

Keeler, like Anderson, found that there was a significantly positive correlation between staff morale and student productivity among Grade IX students in the province of Alberta. He also found that leader behaviour of a principal of a school, as perceived by his staff, and as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, was

²Boris Blai, Jr., "An Occupational Study of Job Satisfaction and Needs Satisfaction," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXII (Summer, 1964), pp. 383-388.

³Ibid.

⁴L.W. Anderson, "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), pp. 693-698.

significantly and positively related to productivity of the schools.⁵

Again, in relationship to productivity, MacKay found that a high degree of hierarchical authority was associated with a low effectiveness rating of the schools. In other words, teachers who saw their system as having a high degree of hierarchical authority generally did not classify their schools as 'good'. The author suggested that if teachers do not see their schools as being 'good schools', they will tend to be generally unenthusiastic in their work.⁶

Many studies have found a direct relationship between teacher dissatisfaction and teacher mobility. In a study done in New York State, Greene found that dissatisfaction, mainly with the administration, the school, and the community, resulted in teacher turnover. He found also that the teachers' solution to the problem of dissatisfaction was to seek another teaching position elsewhere.⁷ Again, in a study done in Ohio, Thomas found that although women did not leave the school systems because of dissatisfactions, nevertheless, the major causes of men leaving corresponded closely to the causes of their dissatisfactions.

⁵B. T. Keeler, "The Leader Behaviour of Principals, Staff Morale, and Productivity," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961, pp. 126-127.

⁶D. A. MacKay, "Should Schools Be Bureaucratic?", The Canadian Administrator, IV (November, 1964), p. 7.

⁷G. E. Greene, "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary School Teachers in the Central Schools of New York State for the Year 1961-1962," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, New York, 1964.

Furthermore, it was found that among males over two thirds of their causes for leaving were avoidable.⁸ Butler found, too, from a study in Illinois, that there was a direct positive relationship between job satisfaction and the retention of beginning teachers.⁹

Many of these findings are perhaps related to the theory that employees adapt to frustrations, failure, short term prospective, and conflict involved in their work situations by leaving the organization.¹⁰

II. FACTORS RELATED TO DISSATISFACTION

In Part I an attempt was made to show that dissatisfaction and low productivity are related, and that dissatisfaction and teacher mobility are likewise related. In each case researchers reported a positive relationship. The following sections present the major factors which have been reported in several studies to relate to satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

From a very extensive study done by Chase involving 1784 teachers in 43 states, the following generalizations were made:

⁸ W. P. Thomas, "A Study of Factors Associated with the Retention of Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Cuyahoga County, Ohio," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1964.

⁹ T. M. Butler, "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, XXXVI (September, 1961), pp. 11-13.

¹⁰ C. Argyris, Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), p. 78.

1. Teachers feel that their satisfaction is greatly affected by 'freedom to plan their own work', and by a sense of professional status and responsibility.

2. Satisfaction in teaching is affected by teachers' feelings with regard to the adequacy of salary, and by opportunity to participate in determination of salary schedules.

3. Teachers' feelings with regard to the quality of professional leadership and supervision are closely related to their feelings towards the system as a whole.

4. Feelings on the part of teachers that they have an opportunity to participate regularly and actively in educational planning and policy making is closely related to the extent of satisfaction with the system in which they are working.

5. Satisfaction in the system is dependent to a considerable extent upon a feeling by teachers that the teaching load, school plant, equipment and supplies, and other working conditions are such as to permit effective work.¹¹

Chase also found that there were significant differences between men and women, superior and inferior teachers (as rated by superintendents), and elementary and secondary school teachers in terms of the factors operating to produce satisfaction.¹² In a follow-up to this

¹¹F. S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), pp. 127-132.

¹²Ibid.

study it was discovered that most of the above factors were again found to be related to satisfaction. Perhaps an addition of the later study to the above factors of satisfaction was the finding related to community influence and morale. It appeared to be of utmost importance to teachers that the people of the community believe in and support education and the value and work of the teacher.¹³

A survey of several other studies done in this area revealed a marked similarity between findings reported in these studies and those of the above study. For example, Francoeur, using a modification of the Chase instrument, found that the factor most likely to produce satisfaction was helpful and stimulating leadership, and supervision in the form of personal and technical assistance. On the other hand, lack of opportunity to participate in making the curriculum, and the limited organization of ingroup activities of a social or cultural nature were among the greatest contributors to dissatisfaction.¹⁴

In reference to Blai's research based on Maslow's theory, it was found that the greatest needs as job satisfiers were interesting duties, job security, and self-actualization.¹⁵

Aikenhead, in a study related to Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, found that although there was a high degree of satisfaction

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴K. Francoeur, "Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

¹⁵Blai, loc. cit.

among teachers as compared with members of other occupations, nevertheless, inadequate school plant, irate parents, and discipline problems were among the multiple areas of dissatisfaction.¹⁶

Prior to doing a study on teacher mobility and dissatisfaction among Illinois teachers, Butler speculated that there was a relationship between the above two variables (teacher mobility and dissatisfaction).¹⁷ Also, similar to the findings reported by Chase, Butler found a significant difference between men and women in terms of dissatisfaction. Married men were found to be more dissatisfied than women, especially with salaries. He generalized from his study as follows:

The most significant causes of job satisfaction or lack of same are the feelings towards the administration of the school, the feelings of freedom in the classroom or lack of it, and whether or not there was involvement in school policy making. Ranking next in importance are feelings of being or not being heard with regard to policy making decisions affecting teachers.¹⁸

A study done in 1959, in the state of Illinois involving 1205 teachers, paralleled the findings of Butler. In general, it was found that not salary, but basic failings in human relations on the part of the administrators were most productive of job dissatisfaction. The findings showed that the teaching staff needed to have a genuine stake

¹⁶J. D. Aikenhead, "Teacher Satisfaction and Discouragement," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, VI (June, 1960), pp. 92-.02.

¹⁷Butler, loc. cit.

¹⁸Ibid.

in matters affecting the school.¹⁹

It is interesting to note the similarity between the above causes of dissatisfaction found throughout North American systems and an English study. Rudd and Wiseman surveyed 590 teachers associated with the school of education at the University of Manchester in 1960. It was found that the major areas of dissatisfaction were inadequate salaries, inadequate buildings and equipment, high teaching load, training inadequacies, large classes, lack of free time for certain professional duties, and low status in society.²⁰ As compared with many North American studies, criticism of supervisory practices as a cause of dissatisfaction was noticeably absent from the factors identified by the teachers in this study.

III. FACTORS RELATED TO MOBILITY

An effort was made in Part II to identify general dissatisfaction as an undesirable state of affairs. Also, dissatisfaction was shown to be related to teacher mobility. Then, too, several research findings were presented in Part II which aimed at identifying causes of teacher dissatisfaction. This section deals with factors productive of teacher mobility. It may be observed that many of the factors associated with teacher dissatisfaction may be synonymous with causes of teacher mobility.

¹⁹E. Reinhardt and E. K. Lawson, "Experienced Teachers View Their Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (January, 1959), pp. 147-152.

²⁰W. G. A. Rudd and S. Wiseman, "Sources of Dissatisfaction Among a Group of Teachers," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (November, 1962), 275-291.

Because there is great variation in the research findings with respect to the differences in type, extent, and ordering of identified factors, each study, for the most part, will be presented individually.

From a study done in New Brunswick, Bailey found that twenty-five per cent of the districts participating in the survey reported that teachers resigned because of inadequate housing. An analysis of teacher replies showed that in no district in that province were teachers completely satisfied with housing accommodations. Also, dissatisfaction among teachers resident in rural areas was considerably greater than that shown by teachers resident in cities.²¹ Fisher stated that perhaps two per cent differences in turnover existed between districts having adequate housing, and those where housing was a problem.²² Dalton, too, found that poor living conditions made teaching unattractive in rural areas.²³ Worger substantiated the above findings in that he discovered that housing was the second most important factor affecting job acceptance; that the lack of suitable living accommodations made it difficult to retain married teachers; and that adequate teacherages were an effective force in attracting and retaining administrative personnel

²¹A. W. Bailey, "Living Accommodations for Teachers of Grades VII to XII and its Effects on Teacher Supply and Retention in New Brunswick," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1961.

²²Fisher, loc. cit.

²³J. G. Dalton, "Man Power Problems in Rural Schools," Teachers' College Record, LIX (October, 1957), p. 15.

in centralized schools.²⁴

In a study related to teacher retention in Connecticut, Hill, using open-ended questions, found that forty per cent of the teachers surveyed, suggested that they should be relieved of some of their non-teaching duties; twenty-three per cent suggested reducing class size; and nineteen per cent wanted increased salaries. More teaching materials and more specialized help were suggested by others as means of reducing mobility.²⁵

Greene stated that over fifty per cent of mobility in the Central Schools of New York State for the year 1961-1962 could have been avoided. He reported that the two major reasons for resignations were to accept better positions and to receive higher salaries.²⁶ This is similar to the findings of Thomas who claimed that over two thirds of the dissatisfactions associated with mobility among the males in a county in Ohio were avoidable. He discovered that higher salaries, more opportunities for promotion, and being able to teach in one's major field or preferred grade level, were among the major causes for resignation.²⁷

Coles County, Illinois, has been known for its inability to retain

²⁴F. E. Worger, "An Investigation to Discover the Effectiveness of Teacherages as a Factor in the Retention of Administrative Staff in Centralized Schools," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1958.

²⁵P. W. Hill, "How To Secure and Retain Good Teachers," Education Digest, XXIV (October, 1958), p. 9.

²⁶Greene, loc. cit.

²⁷Thomas, loc. cit.

teaching staff. The mobility has been approximately twenty per cent annually since 1945.²⁸ A survey of ninety-nine teachers of that area showed a number of significant factors related to mobility. Inadequate salaries was given by 39 per cent as the cause of leaving. This was followed by marriage (31 per cent), too many duties other than classroom teaching (27 per cent), large and over-crowded classrooms (21 per cent), lack of equipment and teaching devices (17 per cent), problems in discipline (16 per cent), unhappy inter-personal relations among staff (15 per cent), needed at home (14 per cent), and poor supervision (10 per cent). Other minor factors, such as school board interference and inability to get along with the principal were identified as situational factors contributing to mobility.²⁹

A New Jersey survey, using the exit interview, attempted to discover why twenty-five to thirty per cent of its staff was resigning annually. It was felt that this excessive mobility was undesirable, and should and could be reduced. It was found that "teachers who were leaving were dissatisfied with one administrator and one supervisor, and with a school board attitude in a specific area."³⁰ The result of the survey led to the resignation of the principal in question. The supervisor was given a new assignment, and new methods of teacher-board communications

²⁸R. S. Conville and S.A. Anderson, "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), pp. 10-19.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰K. Dunn, "Do You Know Why Your Teachers Resign?", Overview, II (June, 1961), p. 30.

were set up. The next year the number of teachers who resigned dropped from twenty-one to two.³¹

In one of the few related studies in Canada a number of factors were found to be major causes of dissatisfaction and also causes of teacher mobility. Hohn had teachers rate certain identified factors as being productive of mobility. The following is the hierarchical arrangement of groups of factors in terms of their influence on mobility:

(1) personal and family factors; (2) administrative and supervisory factors; (3) training and professional factors; (4) school and community factors; (5) pupil factors; and (6) working conditions.³²

Bruce, in studying the main reasons for teacher turnover in the state of Idaho, found many of the same causes that have been identified above. He stated that a major cause of turnover was the inadequate community financial support for schools. This source of dissatisfaction was reinforced by what is termed the failure of school patrons to respect and accept teachers like other professional people. Other identified causes of turnover were: (1) future outlook for improvement in working conditions too discouraging; (2) lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment; (3) lack of opportunity for advancement; (4) too little relief from pupil contact during the day; and (5) lack of time for planning, preparing, and evaluating teacher activities.³³

³¹Ibid.

³²E. G. Hohn, "A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

³³W. C. Bruce, "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX (September, 1959), pp. 66-68.

Friedlander was critical of some of the studies which assume that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are opposites. He found that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are, for the most part, unrelated and non-complementary functions, rather than negatively related poles of a single bi-polar continuum.³⁴ This might be true in many circumstances. However, a New York study by Williams seems to contradict the above finding.³⁵ Williams interviewed fifty highly rated teachers as to why they accepted their present positions, and why they intended to return or not to return. The major reasons given for accepting the positions, in order of importance, were teacher's perception of the reputation of the school, good salaries, the school location, the community rapport, the healthy inter-personal relations among staff members, and the nature of the plant and equipment. In connection with the major reasons why thirty chose to return to the same schools, good supervision ranked first. This was followed in order by good working conditions, salaries, administration, school standards, and teachers' organizations. Contrary to Friedlander's statement that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are unrelated and non-complementary, Williams found that the teachers who decided to leave expressed a negation of the reasons given by those who stayed.³⁶ Williams emphasized the fact that responses from teachers leaving their positions were highly critical of supervision within the system.

³⁴ F. Friedlander, "Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVII (January, 1964), p. 388.

³⁵ M.F. Williams, "To Attract and Hold Good Teachers," The School Executive, LXXIX (September, 1959), pp. 66-68.

³⁶ Ibid.

IV. SUMMARY

Part I of this chapter has presented research findings to support two positions. Firstly, job dissatisfaction has been found in certain studies to be positively correlated with teacher effectiveness and pupil productivity. Secondly, job dissatisfaction has been found in a number of studies to be significantly and positively correlated with teacher mobility.

Part II has presented research findings which identify factors found to be related to job dissatisfaction in teaching. Basic failings in human relations on the part of the administrator in the school system have been frequently cited as correlates of teacher dissatisfaction in American studies reviewed. Poor working conditions, unhealthy school-community relationships, heavy work load, lack of free time for certain professional duties, and low salaries are among the other factors related to dissatisfaction.

In Part III many factors have been identified as being significantly related to teacher mobility. In general, school factors, or, more specifically, lack of teaching aids and equipment, too heavy a teaching load, lack of time for planning, poor working conditions, and overcrowded classrooms, have been identified as perhaps the most important items related to teacher mobility.

Several studies have reported that undesirable supervisory practices, especially as they relate to the principal of the school, correlated with teacher mobility.

Inadequate salaries have been found to be a major cause of teacher dissatisfaction, and this also has been shown to have encouraged teachers to move from one area to another while remaining in the profession.

Community factors, such as inadequate living and housing accommodations for teachers, the socio-economic level of the area, and the philosophy of the community members in terms of their attitude towards education in general, have been shown to be related to the inability of an area to maintain a stable staff.

Personal and family factors were identified by many writers as being influential in terms of teacher mobility, and in some cases were found to be the most significant factor. Professional factors, e. g. , the opportunity to teach in one's major field, and opportunities for promotion were found to be significantly related to mobility. Pupil factors related to discipline and pupil attitude caused some unrest among teaching staffs. Finally, unhappy board-staff relationships was found to be among the significant factors related to teacher mobility.

In conclusion, it must be pointed out that it is difficult, if not impossible, on the basis of the existing literature to present the above factors in a hierarchical arrangement because many of the studies have found considerable difference in the arrangement of factors in terms of their influence on teacher mobility. Although it has been suggested that factors related to working conditions and supervisory factors have been found frequently to be positively correlated with teacher mobility, these have not been consistent findings. In many cases, also, the findings of various studies have not been treated in a manner which

could lead to any conclusions about the hierarchical arrangement of factors in terms of their influence on mobility. Possibly, too, the incidence and the hierarchical arrangement of factors related to teacher mobility may be different from area to area.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

1. Aikenhead, J. D. "Teacher Satisfaction and Discouragement," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, VI (June, 1960), 92-102.
2. Anderson, L. W. "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), 693-698.
3. Argyris, C. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
4. Bailey, A. W. "Living Accommodations for Teachers of Grades VII to XII and its Effects on Teacher Supply and Retention in New Brunswick." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1961.
5. Blai, Boris, Jr. "An Occupational Study of Job Satisfaction and Needs Satisfaction," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXII (Summer, 1964), 383-388.
6. Bruce, W. C. "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), 29.
7. Butler, T. M. "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, XXXVI (September, 1961), 11-13.
8. Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), 126-132.
9. Conville R. S., and S. A. Anderson. "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), 10-19.
10. Dalton, J. G. "Man Power Problems in Rural Schools," Teachers' College Record, LIX (October, 1957), 14-19.
11. Dunn, K. "Do You Know Why Your Teachers Resign?", Overview, II (June, 1961), 30.
12. Fisher, D. D. "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Record, XL (January, 1963), 374.
13. Francoeur, K. "Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.
14. Friedlander, F. "Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVII (January, 1964), 388-392.

15. Greene, G. E. "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary School Teachers in the Central Schools of New York State for the Year 1961-1962." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, New York, 1964.
16. Hill, P. W. "How to Secure and Retain Good Teachers," Educational Digest, XXIV (October, 1958), 8-10.
17. Hohn, E. G. "A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.
18. Keeler, B. T. "The Leadership Behaviour of Principals, Staff Morale, and Productivity." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.
19. Kleinman, L. "A New Dimension in Teacher Selection," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (September, 1960), 24-33.
20. MacKay, D. A. "Should Schools be Bureaucratic?", The Canadian Administrator, IV (November, 1964).
21. Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
22. McLaughlin, J., and B. Nicholson. "Why Teachers Quit Teaching," Nation's Schools, LVIII (November, 1959), 60-61.
23. Reinhardt, E., and E. K. Lawson. "Experienced Teachers View Their Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (January, 1959), 147-152.
24. Rudd, W. G. A., and S. Wiseman. "Sources of Dissatisfaction Among a Group of Teachers," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (November, 1962), 275-291.
25. Thomas, W. P. "A Study of Factors Associated with the Retention of Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Cuyahoga County, Ohio." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1964.
26. Wiles, K. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
27. Williams, M. F. "To Attract and Hold Good Teachers," The School Executive, LXXIX (September, 1959), 66-68.
28. Worger, F. E. "An Investigation to Discover the Effectiveness of Teacherages as a Factor in the Retention of Administrative Staff in Centralized Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1958.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Based on the literature in the field of teacher mobility a questionnaire was constructed which included a number of items found in related research. As a result of critical analyses made by a number of teachers who had had the experience of teaching in several Newfoundland communities, and on suggestions made by the writer's thesis committee, several revisions were made of the original questionnaire. The questionnaire which appears in Appendix A is the instrument used in the collection of data for the present study.

The questionnaire is divided into two sections. Section A required the respondent to provide certain personal and professional data such as sex, marital status, years of training, and years of experience. Section B contains eighty-two factors, most of which have been found in related research to relate to teacher mobility. These factors have been classified under nine headings as follows:

- A. Administrative and Supervisory Factors.
- B. Community Factors.
- C. Economic Factors.
- D. Personal and Family Factors.
- E. Pupil Factors.
- F. Religious Factors.
- G. School Board Factors.

H. Training and Professional Factors.

I. Working Conditions

At the end of Section B, respondents were asked to list the changes necessary before consideration would be given to the idea of returning to the school from which the teacher moved. It was hoped that this section of the questionnaire would provide some relevant comments which could be incorporated into a discussion of the findings of this study.

II. THE SAMPLE AND DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES

In order to obtain the names and addresses of the teacher population from which the sample was selected, a letter was sent to Dr. P. J. Warren, Chairman of the Commission on Education and Youth in Newfoundland. Dr. Warren arranged through his secretary and the Department of Education Superintendents, for the provision of the necessary information.

The teachers to whom questionnaires were sent represent a random sample of 194 of the 651 teachers who met the conditions set down a priori for participation in this study. The conditions were firstly, that the teacher was certificated, and secondly, that he had moved from a school in which he was teaching in Newfoundland in 1964-1965 to another school in the same province for the school year 1965-1966. A sample of 194 teachers is equal to 30 per cent of the total population of 651. The sample was stratified by sex and by type of school system

from which the teachers moved. In order to stratify the sample and to insure randomness the following procedures were used:

1. The population was divided into six bins according to the school system from which teachers moved, and a sample of thirty per cent of the population was randomly selected from each bin. This procedure was aimed at stratifying the sample by school system.
2. In order to determine whether the sample was stratified by sex, tests of the differences between the male and female numbers selected from each bin, using the related male and female statistics of the population as the expected frequencies, were determined by the statistical procedure chi square. No significant differences at the .01 level of confidence were found on tests related to either of the five school systems. Because of the small number involved in the Pentecostal segment of the sample no test of significance was applied.

The sampling procedure resulted in a sample of one hundred male and ninety-four female teachers distributed among all six school systems (Table I).

A copy of the questionnaire was sent to each of the 194 teachers involved in the study, in February, 1966. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed so that the completed form could be mailed directly to the writer. Although the respondents were encouraged to maintain anonymity, many of them elected to sign their names. A check on the signatures and the postmarks assisted in identifying those teachers who had not responded. A follow-up letter was sent to those early in March in order to elicit a greater response. The final date for receipt of questionnaires used in the study was March 30, 1966.

TABLE I
TEACHER MOBILITY POPULATION AND RELATED SAMPLE
BY SEX AND SCHOOL SYSTEM

School System	<u>Population Statistics^a</u>			<u>Sample Estimates</u>		
	Male	Female	Totals	Male	Female	Totals
Amalgamated	55	49	104	17	13	30
Anglican	91	71	162	28	20	48
Pentecostal	4	5	9	2	1	3
Roman Catholic	54	147	201	23	37	60
Salvation Army	10	13	23	4	3	7
United Church	91	61	152	26	20	46
Total	305	346	651	100	94	194

^a

The figures presented do not include licensed teachers or teachers belonging to religious orders.

Table II indicates that of the 194 questionnaires mailed 123 have been used in this study. Five questionnaires were returned by the post office because of insufficient or incorrect address. Thirteen returns had to be discarded for various reasons, such as failure by respondents to complete the necessary minimum of information, or because the respondent did not meet the criteria necessary for participation in the study. Regarding this last point, a number of respondents had not been teaching during the whole school year 1964-1965, and consequently were eliminated from the study. Therefore, of the questionnaires which were delivered to teachers qualified to participate in this study, seventy per cent were used.

III. TREATMENT OF DATA

Section A of the questionnaire containing the personal and professional characteristics of teachers involved was treated first in this study. These data--such as age, years of experience, and years of training--are presented in table form in Chapter IV and from the various tables a profile is presented of what Adamson calls the 'composite teacher'.¹

Each respondent was asked to rate each factor in Section B of the questionnaire according to the influence it had on his moving from the school in which he last taught. The responses were made by circling

¹A. K. Adamson, "An Analysis of the Teacher Turnover Problem in Idaho, 1958-1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, Idaho State College, 1960.

TABLE II
TABULATION OF SURVEY RETURNS

	Number of Questionnaires	Per Cent of Total Group
Returned undelivered	5	2.6
Returned by respondents		
used in present study	123	63.4
unusable	13	6.7
received too late to use	9	4.6
Questionnaires unaccounted for	44	22.7
Total mailed	194	100.0

either one of the letters D, M, S, or N, corresponding respectively to decided influence, moderate influence, slight influence, or no influence.

In scoring each factor of Section B of the questionnaire, the numbers 4, 3, 2, and 1 were assigned, corresponding respectively to decided influence, moderate influence, slight influence, and no influence. From this scale, which is assumed to be an interval scale, means were calculated for each individual factor and for each group of factors. If a factor was not rated by the respondent, it was arbitrarily scored as no influence and assigned the value of 1 for convenience of calculating means.

IV. TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: Teachers will identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors.

1.1: Certain factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors.

1.2: Certain groups of factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other groups of factors.

The treatment of this hypothesis for the sample as a whole involved five basic steps as follows:

1. Calculation of the means for all individual factors and groups of factors.

2. The tabular presentation of the means of all eighty-two factors ranked from largest to smallest. The group means were presented in the same fashion.

3. The calculation of a number of 't' tests in comparing certain factors with each other as well as certain groups of factors with other groups.

4. A presentation of the means of the individual factors within each group.

5. Analysis and interpretation of the findings.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

2.1: Teachers classified on the basis of sex differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

The means of each factor were calculated for the sixty-three male and sixty female respondents, and 't' tests of the difference between pairs of means were used to test the hypothesis.

2.2: Teachers classified on the basis of years of professional preparation differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

For the purpose of testing this hypothesis, the total number of respondents was divided into two groups based on years of professional preparation. Means for each group were determined for each individual factor. The statistical procedure used in testing this hypothesis was analysis of covariance with sex covaried.

2.3: Teachers classified on the basis of years of teaching experience differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

In testing this hypothesis the total number of respondents was divided into two groups based on years of teaching experience. The statistical method used in testing this hypothesis was analysis of

covariance with the variables sex and professional preparation covaried.

Hypothesis 3: Teachers classified on the basis of the school system from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

In testing this hypothesis four groups were used corresponding to the Amalgamated, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and United Church school systems. The groups were compared by the use of analysis of covariance with sex, school size, and community population covaried. Because of the small numbers involved, the Pentecostal and the Salvation Army respondents were not used in this treatment.

Hypothesis 4: Teachers classified on the basis of the number of teachers in the school from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to identified factors.

Respondents were divided into two groups using the number of teachers in the schools in which they were teaching during the school year 1964-1965 as an index of school size. The statistical procedure used in testing the hypothesis was 't' tests of the difference between pairs of means.

Hypothesis 5: Teachers classified on the basis of the community from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to identified factors.

Respondents were divided into two groups on the basis of the size of the community from which they moved. The statistical treatment used was analysis of covariance with sex and school size covaried.

Because none of the above hypotheses predict the direction of the difference, a two tailed test of the difference between the means was employed in all statistical treatments. The critical level of significance was set a priori at .05.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

1. Adamson, A. K. "An Analysis of the Teacher Turnover Problem in Idaho, 1958-1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, Idaho State College, Idaho, 1960.

CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a descriptive analysis of the data gathered from Section A of the questionnaire, Personal and Professional Data (see Appendix A). Where possible an attempt is made to compare the sample estimates with the mobile teacher population and also with the whole Newfoundland teaching force.

I. MARITAL STATUS, SEX, AND AGE

Of the 123 respondents comprising the sample used in this study 71 were single, 50 were married, and 2 were widowed. The most recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics data on the Newfoundland teaching force showed that for the school year 1963-1964 the proportion of single to married teachers was 2841 to 1703 respectively.¹ Whereas these data were not as recent as the sample used in this study, it might be reasonable to assume that the general characteristics of the population have not changed appreciably during the interim, and consequently may be used as a point of comparison. Based on this assumption it may be generalized that the proportion of single and married respondents approximated the respective population parameters. Neither the sample nor the comparable

¹ Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, Education Division, 1963-1964, p. 23.

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
MARITAL STATUS

M A R I T A L S T A T U S			
Single	Married	Widowed	Total
71	50	2	123

statistics included members of religious orders teaching in Newfoundland schools.

The distribution of respondents by sex presented in Table IV indicates that there were nineteen more single female than single male respondents, whereas among married respondents almost the reverse existed with thirty-seven married males and thirteen married females. There were a total of sixty-three males and sixty females in the sample. The Newfoundland teaching population for 1963-1964 showed approximately a 2:1 female-male ratio among certificated teachers, which was quite different from the sample estimate.² However, the mobile population of 651, from which the sample was drawn, had a 1:1 female-male ratio which is approximately reflected in the sample. This would seem to suggest that the percentage of mobility was greater among male teachers for the period under study.

Table IV further illustrates that eighty-five per cent of the respondents were under twenty-five years of age, with only eight per cent over forty years of age. This suggests that there is excessive mobility among younger people, although there are no statistics available to validate this conclusion. It has been suggested in related literature where similar findings occurred that it was a characteristic of younger people to be more mobile.³

²Ibid.

³E. Hohn, "Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964, p. 42.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS
BY SEX AND AGE

Sex	Single		Married		Others		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Age under 19 years	1	7	0	0	0	0	8
Age 20-24 years	21	31	4	6	0	0	62
Age 25-29 years	3	5	23	4	0	0	35
Age 30-34 years	0	2	2	1	0	0	5
Age 35-39 years	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Age over 40 years	0	1	6	1	1	1	10
Total	25	46	37	13	1	1	123

II. ANNUAL SALARY

Table V presents a comparison of the salaries received by respondents during the school years 1964-1965 and 1965-1966. Whereas there were twenty-seven receiving salaries below \$2500 in 1964-1965, only six were in that salary bracket during 1965-1966. There was, in fact, a general shift towards the higher salary brackets in 1965-1966. Salary increments resulting from an extra year of teaching experience coupled with a five per cent increase in salaries for all teachers in the province in 1965-1966 probably accounted for most of the change. However, even though Newfoundland has a provincial salary scale, a number of communities do offer special bonuses in order to attract better qualified teachers. It is not unlikely that part of the salary differentiation presented in Table V may be accounted for by these bonuses.

III. TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

The distribution of respondents by teaching experience is presented in Table VI. A total of seventy-seven respondents, or sixty-two per cent, spent only one year in their former school, and ninety-three per cent spent under five years. We would expect to find this when considering the age distribution of respondents reported earlier, which showed that seventy of the respondents who moved were under twenty-five years of age (supra, Table IV, p. 44).

Referring to the total teaching experience of respondents, Table VI indicates that twenty-three of the sixty females, as compared with eighteen

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS
1964-1965 AND 1965-1966 BY ANNUAL SALARY

Annual Salary	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
\$ Below 2500	8	19	27	1	5	6
2500-2999	8	17	25	6	19	25
3000-3499	11	14	25	14	20	34
3500-3999	15	3	18	9	5	14
4000-4999	12	5	17	18	9	27
Over 5000	9	2	11	15	2	17
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Teaching Experience	Male	Female	Total
Within the Last School			
1 year	41	36	77
2 years	6	13	19
3 years	8	5	13
4 years	3	3	6
5 years and beyond	5	3	8
Total	63	60	123
Total Teaching Experience			
1-3 years	18	23	41
4-7 years	26	26	52
8 years and beyond	19	11	30
Total	63	60	123

of the sixty-three males had from one to three years of experience. Again, fifty-two respondents, or thirty-seven per cent, and thirty respondents, or twenty-five per cent, taught from four to seven and beyond seven years respectively.

Table VII illustrates that fifty-seven of the respondents, or forty-six per cent, possessed one year of professional preparation. There were thirty-four respondents with two years and thirty-two with beyond two years of professional preparation. These figures presented in Table VI on total teaching experience and in Table VII closely approximate the relative proportions in the total teaching force, using data from the 1963-1964 Dominion Bureau of Statistics as the point of comparison.⁴

IV. COMMUNITY, TYPE OF SCHOOL, AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Table VIII presents a comparison between the populations of the communities where respondents taught in 1964-1965 with the communities in which they taught during the school year 1965-1966. A comparison of the totals in Table VIII shows that a net result of seven respondents or six per cent of the total sample moved to larger population centers. Although there was some mobility of teachers from the larger to the smaller communities, there seemed to be a general tendency for teachers to gravitate towards larger communities.

Table IX represents the type of school in which respondents were

⁴Dominion Bureau of Statistics, op. cit., p. 56.

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Professional Preparation	Male	Female	Total
1 year	17	40	57
2 years	18	16	34
3 years	9	2	11
4 years	12	2	14
5 years	6	0	6
6 years	1	0	1
7 years	0	0	0
Total	63	60	123

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY
FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS 1964-1965 AND 1965-1966

Community Population	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Below 1000	29	18	47	25	15	40
1000-3999	18	18	36	17	21	38
Over 4000	13	23	36	18	23	41
Not indicated	3	1	4	3	1	4
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

teaching in 1965-1966 as compared with the type of school from which they moved. Although some tendency for men to move away from elementary to secondary positions is evident, in general, there appeared to be no appreciable change from 1964-1965 to 1965-1966. In both school years the largest percentage of respondents taught in all grade schools, which constitute the majority of schools in Newfoundland. It may be observed that a disproportionate number of schools are classified under 'others' in Table IX. This may be mainly due to the fact that the questionnaire used in this study made no provision for those Newfoundland elementary schools which have a grade range from Kindergarten to Grade Eight.

Table X represents a distribution of respondents by type of school system. The 1964-1965 classification of the sample indicated that there were thirty-eight respondents teaching in Roman Catholic schools and thirty-six in the Anglican system, followed by twenty-three Amalgamated, twenty United Church, four Salvation Army, and two Pentecostal respondents. This very closely approximated the situation in the total teaching force⁵ and in the mobile population from which the sample was drawn. However, in the total teaching force, United Church teachers outnumbered those in the Amalgamated system, which is the reverse of the situation presented under 1964-1965 of Table X. The fact that the distribution of teachers by school systems differed from 1964-1965 to 1965-1966 indicates a degree of inter-system mobility.

⁵Department of Education Newfoundland, Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report of the Department of Education, published by the Authority of the Minister of Education, Newfoundland, 1963, pp. 25-29.

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS
1964-1965 AND 1965-1966 BY THE TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
All Grade (K-11)	19	17	36	21	11	32
Elementary (K-6)	15	18	33	6	23	29
Central High (7-11)	11	4	15	15	3	18
Regional High (9-11)	9	0	9	9	0	9
Others	9	21	30	12	23	35
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

TABLE X

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS
1964-1965 AND 1965-1966 BY TYPE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM

School System	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Amalgamated	11	12	23	10	9	19
Anglican	21	15	36	20	11	31
Pentecostal	0	2	2	0	2	2
Roman Catholic	14	24	38	14	24	38
Salvation Army	2	2	4	2	2	4
United Church	15	5	20	17	12	29
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

Table XI indicates the extent of inter-system and intra-system mobility for the sample used in this study. The greatest amount of inter-system mobility appeared to be among the Amalgamated, Anglican, and United Church systems. A total of thirteen of the Amalgamated respondents moved into other systems for the school year 1965-1966, with five and eight going to the Anglican and United Church systems respectively. Six of the respondents classified under the Anglican system in 1964-1965 moved into the Amalgamated system in 1965-1966, and two moved to the United Church system. Only one United Church respondent experienced inter-system mobility, and that was to the Amalgamated system. No Roman Catholic respondents experienced inter-system mobility, which may be expected when considering that the inter-system mobility described above is between the Amalgamated and the protestant systems, and that the Newfoundland Amalgamated school system is almost entirely a Protestant amalgamation.

V. SCHOOL SIZE, GRADES TAUGHT, AND POSITION HELD

Using the number of teachers in a school as an index of school size, it may be observed in Table XII that there was a tendency for teachers to move to larger schools. This is indicated by the fact that whereas there were forty-six respondents teaching in one to four teacher schools in 1964-1965, only twenty-nine were teaching in the same type of school during the 1965-1966 school year. In fact, by observing the relative totals presented in Table XII, a general overall shift towards larger schools is noticeable. This parallels the finding presented in

TABLE XI

A MATRIX OF INTER-SYSTEM AND INTRA-SYSTEM MOBILITY
OF RESPONDENTS FROM 1964-1965 TO 1965-1966

School System	1964-1965						Total
	Amal. ^a	Ang.	Pent.	R.C.	S.A.	U.C.	
1965-1966							
Amal.	10	6	0	0	0	1	17
Ang.	5	28	0	0	0	0	33
Pent.	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
R.C.	0	0	0	33	0	0	33
S.A.	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
U.C.	8	2	0	0	0	19	29
Total	23	36	2	33	4	20	123

- ^a
- Amal. Amalgamated School System
 - Ang. Anglican School System
 - Pent. Pentecostal School System
 - R.C. Roman Catholic School System
 - S.A. Salvation Army School System
 - U.C. United Church School System

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS
1964-1965 AND 1965-1966 BY SIZE OF SCHOOL^a

Number of Teachers	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1-4 Teachers	24	22	46	15	14	29
5-9 Teachers	22	15	37	27	18	45
10-14 Teachers	7	11	18	7	14	21
15-19 Teachers	4	5	9	5	3	8
20-24 Teachers	3	4	7	7	5	6
Over 25 Teachers	3	3	6	4	5	9
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

^a

The number of teachers is used as an index of school size.

Table VIII (supra, p. 50) which indicated a gravitation of teachers towards the larger community. It should be pointed out, however, that the increase in the number of larger schools constructed during the past decade would partly account for this finding, but might not be enough to account for the entire change when considering mobility for only a one year period as was the case in the present study.

Table XIII indicates that whereas there were forty-two respondents teaching one grade during the school year 1964-1965, a total of fifty-six, representing an increase of twelve per cent, were teaching only one grade in 1965-1966. This might indicate a tendency for teachers to move from the small schools of four or fewer classrooms, where usually a number of grades are taught in one classroom, to schools where teachers have only one grade to teach.

Table XIV presents a distribution of respondents by position held during the school year 1964-1965 as compared with the position held during 1965-1966. Fifteen more respondents occupied positions other than principal or vice-principal in 1965-1966 than in the previous school year. This showed a tendency for principals and vice-principals to vacate administrative roles for teaching positions. This might be related to the teacher drift to the larger school presented in Table XII (supra, p. 56) where, for example, 'teachers' in the one and two room schools who were automatically classified as principals and vice-principals might not hold these positions in the larger schools.

VI. SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

In a number of comparisons, the sample used in the present study

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS 1964-1965
AND 1965-1966 BY THE NUMBER OF GRADES TAUGHT

Number of Grades Taught	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1 Grade	13	29	42	20	36	56
2 Grades	16	12	28	17	11	28
3 Grades	21	10	31	18	9	27
4 Grades	8	7	15	4	2	6
Over 5 Grades	5	2	7	4	2	6
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

TABLE XIV

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE SCHOOL YEARS
1964-1965 AND 1965-1966 BY POSITION HELD

Position Held	1964-1965			1965-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Teacher	29	50	79	38	56	94
Principal	28	9	37	22	4	26
Vice-principal	6	1	7	3	0	3
Total	63	60	123	63	60	123

was representative of the total teaching force in Newfoundland using 1962-1964 statistics as points of comparison. However, it must be pointed out that many of the comparisons used in this chapter were made with provincial data gathered a year or two earlier than the period under study. In addition, some of the population statistics contained licensed teachers which were not contained in the sample.

A profile based on what Adamson calls the composite teacher⁶ indicates that the typical mobile teacher was a single female between the ages of twenty and twenty-four who received an annual salary of less than \$2500 in 1964-1965, but received a salary between \$3000 and \$3499 in 1965-1966. She had from four to seven years of teaching experience and one year of professional preparation. She also moved from a community with a population of less than one thousand to a community with a population of over four thousand, and from an all-grade school to another school of the same type. The teacher also moved from a school in which the total number of teachers was between one and four to a school where there were from five to nine teachers. In both cases the number of grades taught was one. She held a teaching position rather than a principalship or vice-principalship.

Table XV presents a picture of this composite teacher. Although in reality this person may not exist, the aim of this presentation is to highlight, in the way of a summary, the salient characteristics of what might be called the typical mobile teacher.

⁶ A. K. Adamson, "An Analysis of the Teacher Turnover Problem in Idaho, 1958-1959," Unpublished Master's thesis, Idaho State College, 1960.

TABLE XV
THE COMPOSITE TEACHER

1. Marital Status	Single
2. Sex	Female
3. Age	20-24 Years
4. Annual Salary Last	Below \$2500
5. Annual Salary Now	\$3000-\$3499
6. Experience	4-7 Years
7. Professional Preparation	1 Year
8. Community Population Last	Below 1000
9. Community Population Now	Over 4000
10. Type of School Last	K-11
11. Type of School Now	K-11
12. School System	Roman Catholic
13. Number of Teachers Last	1-4
14. Number of Teachers Now	5-9
15. Position Held	Teacher

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

1. Adamson, A. K. "An Analysis of the Teacher Turnover Problem in Idaho, 1958-1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, Idaho State College, 1960.
2. Department of Education Newfoundland. Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report of the Department of Education. Published by Authority of the Minister of Education, 1963.
3. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools. Education Division, 1963-1964.
4. Hohn, E. "Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL FACTORS AND GROUPS OF FACTORS

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which certain identified factors and groups of factors influence teacher mobility among certificated teachers in the province of Newfoundland. Section B of the questionnaire used in this study (see Appendix A) required selected teachers to indicate by means of a Likert-type scale the extent to which each of the eighty-two factors, classified under nine headings, influenced their decision to move from their teaching position in one school in Newfoundland during the school year 1964-1965 to another school in 1965-1966. Hypothesis I in Chapter III states that teachers will identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors. The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the analyses related to this hypothesis and to critically analyze the findings.

Hypothesis 1.1: Certain factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors.

In the treatment of the data related to Hypothesis 1.1, means were calculated for each of the eighty-two factors identified in this study. Any respondent who occupied a position as principal or vice-principal in 1964-1965 was not included in the calculation of the means of factors included under the heading of Administrative Factors. This decision

was made because the first thirteen factors required respondents to rate the administration of their former schools in terms of their mobility. Once means were calculated factors were arranged in the order of magnitude from the largest to the smallest means. When ties in means occurred, the factor having the least number of respondents indicating N or 'no influence' was arbitrarily ranked as the largest mean. Where the same number of respondents indicated 'no influence', the factor having the greatest number of responses under D or 'decided influence' was given top priority. Each of the top twenty factor means was compared with each of the bottom twenty factor means by the use of 't' tests. The results of this treatment together with related discussion are presented below.

Findings. Table XVI indicates that the range of the means of individual factors is from 1.05 to 2.42 with a fairly uniform distribution of means between those two extremes. Whereas a total of sixty-three per cent of the respondents chose factor one in Table XVI as a contributor to their mobility, only five per cent indicated factor eighty-two as having any influence on their moving. A further comparison between the larger and smaller means reveals that each of the top twenty factor means is significantly greater than each of the bottom twenty factor means at or beyond the .05 level of confidence, when using 't' tests in making the comparisons. Consequently, even though no statistical procedures other than the 't' tests mentioned above have been employed to arrange the means in the exact order in which they

TABLE XVI
DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	(ID) ^a	Responses ^b				Total ^c	Mean
			D	M	S	N		
1.	I desired to broaden my experiences.	Per	36	25	17	45	123	2.42
2.	Entertainment and recreational facilities were inadequate.	C	19	19	22	63	123	1.95
3.	Large classes made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	W	20	13	24	66	123	1.89
4.	I wanted to be nearer my home town or place of family residence.	Per	21	16	9	77	123	1.85
5.	A lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment existed.	W	14	16	27	66	123	1.82
6.	I just enjoy moving around.	Per	13	16	23	71	123	1.76
7.	The living and housing conditions were unsatisfactory for teachers.	C	17	16	9	81	123	1.75
8.	Pupils lacked a desire to learn, and had poor attitudes and study habits.	Pu	14	12	24	73	123	1.73
9.	There were too many grades in one class.	W	18	10	11	84	123	1.69
10.	The community displayed a lack of interest in school affairs.	C	10	13	27	73	123	1.67
11.	The future outlook for improvement in working conditions was too discouraging.	W	17	5	19	82	123	1.65
12.	There was lack of, or inadequate janitorial service.	W	15	12	11	85	123	1.65
13.	The community offered inadequate material support for the school.	C	9	12	25	77	123	1.62
14.	There were too many low ability pupils to teach.	Pu	11	12	17	83	123	1.60
15.	The cost of travelling from the community where I taught last year to larger population centers was too high.	E	11	13	13	86	123	1.59
16.	I wished to be closer to the university.	Per	16	8	9	90	123	1.59
17.	I wished to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boyfriend's (girlfriend's) place of employment.	Per	18	7	5	93	123	1.59
18.	The cost of living was too high in the community where I taught last year.	E	14	7	15	87	123	1.57
19.	The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high.	E	13	10	11	89	123	1.57
20.	The administrative official(s) failed to offer leadership to help teachers solve their problems.	A	6	5	16	52	79	1.56
21.	Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family.	C	14	8	11	90	123	1.56
22.	Pupils were poorly prepared for the class I taught.	Pu	11	6	23	83	123	1.55
23.	The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to remain on its staff.	S	11	10	15	87	123	1.55
24.	The school building was in poor repair and inadequate.	W	14	5	14	90	123	1.54
25.	The community where I taught last year was too isolated.	C	12	5	17	89	123	1.51
26.	Sufficient time for planning, preparing, and evaluating teaching activities was lacking.	W	8	12	14	89	123	1.50
27.	The attitude existed in the community that teaching was an easy and trivial job.	C	4	9	27	83	123	1.46
28.	The administrative official(s) failed to support teacher decisions, therefore breaking down staff coherence and co-operation.	A	3	6	15	55	79	1.46
29.	The socio-economic status of the community was low.	C	6	10	18	89	123	1.46
30.	There was little or no opportunity of getting a better paying position in my last school.	E	11	5	13	94	123	1.46
31.	There was too little relief from pupils during the day.	Pu	6	9	19	89	123	1.45
32.	The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers.	C	8	8	15	92	123	1.45
33.	Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school.	W	8	11	9	95	123	1.45
34.	Consistent adherence to established policies was not maintained by the administration.	A	2	8	11	58	79	1.42
35.	The administrative official(s) lacked consideration for staff members.	A	6	3	9	61	79	1.42
36.	Discipline was difficult to maintain.	Pu	9	4	16	94	123	1.41
37.	The Board made little or no effort to provide or arrange for adequate housing for teachers.	S	10	4	13	96	123	1.41
38.	Pupils were too disrespectful.	Pu	9	6	12	96	123	1.41
39.	The Board was incompetent.	S	7	9	11	96	123	1.41
40.	Insufficient health services were available.	C	7	9	10	97	123	1.40
41.	The administrative official(s) chose to please pupils and parents at the expense of teachers.	A	5	3	9	62	79	1.38
42.	Teachers were expected to be very active in church activities.	R	8	5	12	98	123	1.37
43.	Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotion, and control of pupils.	W	6	9	10	98	123	1.37
44.	The school had a poor academic record.	T	5	9	11	98	123	1.36
45.	The position offered little opportunity of meeting the opposite sex.	Per	8	4	12	99	123	1.36
46.	The administrative official(s) was/were unfriendly and unapproachable.	A	5	3	7	64	79	1.35
47.	Staff meetings were so controlled by the administration as not to allow for free staff participation.	A	4	5	6	64	79	1.35

Number	Factor	(ID) ^a	Responses ^b			N	Total ^c	Mean
			D	M	S			
48.	The community was too small.	C	6	6	13	98	123	1.35
49.	Pupils were difficult to understand and get along with.	Pu	4	6	18	95	123	1.34
50.	The staff lacked interest in professional activities.	T	5	5	16	97	123	1.33
51.	The school board did not supplement teachers' incomes.	E	4	5	15	99	123	1.30
52.	Teachers' salaries were too low in comparison with other persons in the community.	E	5	6	10	102	123	1.30
53.	Professional competence was not respected among staff members.	T	4	8	9	102	123	1.30
54.	Participation in and contribution to church activities were over-emphasized in evaluating teacher effectiveness in teaching.	R	6	4	10	103	123	1.29
55.	The Board treated teachers unfairly.	S	6	4	10	103	123	1.29
56.	There was lack of, or inadequate clerical assistance with routine clerical duties.	W	5	6	9	103	123	1.29
57.	The administrative official(s) was/were unfair, and discriminated against certain staff members.	A	2	2	12	63	79	1.28
58.	The administrative official(s) failed to appreciate and praise desirable results produced by staff members.	A	2	3	10	64	79	1.28
59.	At the level I was teaching, too wide a gap existed between the theory in the university courses and the school practices.	T	3	6	14	100	123	1.28
60.	The church interfered with the internal operation of the school.	R	6	3	10	104	123	1.28
61.	General supervision of school activities was too rigid, inflexible, and authoritative.	A	2	3	9	65	79	1.27
62.	The work load was too unevenly distributed among staff members.	W	5	4	10	104	123	1.27
63.	I was required to teach subjects and/or grades which I was not trained to teach.	T	5	6	5	107	123	1.26
64.	Staff members made little effort to achieve high academic standards within the school.	T	1	8	12	102	123	1.25
65.	The Board officials interfered unnecessarily in the internal operation of the school.	S	4	3	11	105	123	1.24
66.	Teachers were expected to show special favour to certain children of influential persons and/or groups.	C	2	4	13	104	123	1.22
67.	Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences.	W	4	4	7	108	123	1.22
68.	The Board treated teachers as inferior and non-professional personnel.	S	4	2	10	107	123	1.21
69.	The teachers were expected to teach religion in the school.	R	3	4	9	107	123	1.21
70.	Teacher conduct was too closely scrutinized by the Board.	S	3	2	12	106	123	1.20
71.	The attitude existed in the community that teachers were overpaid.	C	2	6	7	108	123	1.20
72.	Other members of my family wanted a move.	Per	3	5	5	110	123	1.20
73.	The community exerted unnecessary restriction on the religious life of the teachers.	R	1	5	10	107	123	1.19
74.	Teachers were reprimanded by the administration in the presence of students.	A	3	1	3	72	79	1.18
75.	There were too many class interruptions.	W	2	3	4	114	123	1.18
76.	There was too much religious prejudice in the community.	R	1	4	8	110	123	1.15
77.	Too many non-teaching activities such as plays, athletics, clubs, etc. were required.	W	2	2	8	111	123	1.15
78.	The administrative official(s) sought publicity and praise at the expense of the staff.	A	0	3	5	71	79	1.14
79.	Too many P.T.A.'s, staff meetings, workshops, and Teachers' Association meetings were required.	W	0	1	11	111	123	1.11
80.	The community's restriction on free inquiry in the community was unreasonable.	C	1	1	5	116	123	1.08
81.	The Board was dissatisfied with my work.	S	2	0	1	120	123	1.06
82.	There were too many classroom visits by administrative official(s).	A	0	0	4	75	79	1.05

^a (ID): Identification of factor group. A: Administrative; E: Economic; Per: Personal; Pu: Pupil; R: Religious; S: School Board; T: Training; W: Working Conditions.

^b D: Decided Influence; M: Moderate Influence; S: Slight influence; N: No Influence.

^c Respondents occupying administrative positions in their former schools were not included in the total.

appear in Table XVI, nevertheless, it may be generalized that teachers do identify certain factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors.

Discussion. Related literature indicated that where excessive teacher mobility was the situation there was usually a multiplicity of contributing factors rather than a specific cause of mobility.¹ In the present study only 5 of the 123 respondents indicated a single factor as a cause of mobility, and these were all in the area of personal factors usually involving sickness in the immediate family, necessitating a move closer to one's home town. In the remaining 118 cases several factors, often as many as 20, were cited as contributing factors to mobility. A frequent comment made in spaces provided for that purpose in the questionnaire was that although the decision to move was mainly related to one or a few factors, nevertheless, several others were contributing forces. Consequently, any interpretation of the factor means must be made with consideration of the fact that generally several factors influenced a person's decision to move.

An analysis of the top twenty factors revealed a range in the means of from 1.56 to 2.24. However, with the exception of factor one, the difference among many of these means is so small that perhaps it is not justifiable to discuss any one factor as being greater than another.

¹C. E. Blocker and R. C. Richardson, "Twenty-five Years of Morale Research: A Critical Review," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVI (January, 1963), p. 208.

Among this top quartile five of the factors are classified as personal. Such items as "I wished to broaden my experiences," "I wanted to be nearer my home town or place of family residence," and "I just enjoy moving around" are perhaps among the less controllable contributors to mobility. Perhaps factor one, namely, "I wished to broaden my experiences," might be a socially acceptable reason to give for moving from one place to another, and, hence, might partly account for the high factor mean in this case. It is suggested, also, that factor six, "I just enjoy moving around," might be the type of item that would elicit great general response, for twenty-three of the fifty-four respondents who indicated this as an influence selected the 'slight influence' response category.

Four of the factors classified under 'Community Factors' appeared among the top twenty presented in Table XVI (supra, pp. 65-66). In reference to factor two, namely, "Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate," many of the respondents to this item offered a comment that the smaller rural community provided no outlet for the younger teacher. This seems to concur with the findings related to Table IV (supra, p. 44) and Table VIII (supra, p. 50) in which it appeared that greater mobility was found among the younger teachers, and that there existed a tendency for teachers to gravitate towards larger community centers.

Of the 123 respondents, 42 selected factor seven, namely, "The housing and living conditions were unsatisfactory for teachers," as a reason contributing to their mobility. Twenty-five teachers commented

throughout their questionnaires on the inadequate housing facilities as a contributing factor in moving from former teaching positions. This item with a mean of 1.75 ranked seventh among the top twenty factors. Lack of parental interest in education and inadequate community support have means of 1.67 and 1.62 respectively. This seems to concur with the findings in related literature which indicates that it is of utmost importance to teachers that the people of the community believe in and support education and the value and work of the teacher.²

Five factors related to working conditions were among the top twelve of the first twenty factors with means ranging from 1.65 to 1.89. All of these five factors, namely, "large classes," "inadequate teaching facilities," "too many grades in one classroom," "discouraging outlook for improvement in working conditions," and "lack of janitorial services," appear to be mainly related to the smaller school in the rural communities of the province. A check throughout the questionnaires revealed that fifty-three of the total number of respondents commented on one or more of these items in an elaboration of the effect it had on their moving. Teachers complained especially about the impossibility of being able to adequately meet the educational needs of students because of large classes, too many grades in one class, and inadequate teaching aids and facilities. This was the area which received the greatest attention on the questionnaire in terms of comments offered by respondents.

² F. S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), pp. 127-132.

Two pupil factors, namely, "Pupils lacked a desire to learn," and "There were too many low ability pupils to teach," received means of 1.73 and 1.60 respectively, and ranked as factors eight and fourteen. Several respondents associated pupil attitude with the community factors related to parental attitude, and suggested that the lack of desire on the part of students to learn, which contributed to their moving, could be remedied mainly by a change in attitude on the part of the parents.

The three economic factors which appeared in the top quartile are "cost of travel" ($X=1.59$), "cost of living in community" ($X=1.57$), and "cost of rent" ($X=1.57$). Twelve respondents commented that a prime contributor to mobility was the high cost of rent in the former community. Several referred to the high cost of living in their former school community. Two respondents commented that they had accepted teaching positions in smaller communities with less comfortable housing and fewer modern conveniences in order to avail themselves of cheaper rent, lower cost of light and fuel, and to avoid municipal taxes. Considering the fact that Newfoundland has a provincial salary scale which does not account for differentiation in living costs for different areas, it appears that certain larger communities might be experiencing a proportion of their mobility because they are unable to compete with the generally lower cost of living of the smaller community. However, this mobility to the smaller community is more than compensated for by the movement in the opposite direction.

Although the related literature reported administrative factors as great contributors to teacher mobility, from the present research

conducted in Newfoundland only one of the thirteen administrative factors identified appeared in the top quartile (supra, Table XVI, pp. 65-66), and it ranked twentieth. However, ten of the remaining twelve administrative factors were ranked between factors twenty and sixty-one. This would seem to suggest that most of the administrative factors identified in this study moderately influenced mobility relative to the other factors. Factor twenty, namely, "Administrative official(s) failed to offer leadership to help teachers solve their problems," received a mean of 1.56. Four respondents criticized principals for not taking more initiative in terms of helping teachers assess their weaknesses in order to improve instruction. Several teachers specifically criticized administrative officials for not supervising their teaching. This is probably substantiated by the overall response to factor eighty-two, namely, "There were too many classroom visits," which received a mean of only 1.05. The general impression is that the converse of factor eighty-two may have been a greater contributing force to mobility. On the other hand, a total of seven respondents who commented throughout their questionnaires said that the autocratic and domineering behaviour of the principal contributed to their reasons for moving.

None of the School Board Factors, Training and Professional Factors, or Religious Factors ranked among the first twenty means. The highest School Board Factor, namely, "The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to remain on the staff," had a mean of 1.55 and ranked twenty-third. Other board factors ranged from number thirty-seven related to housing to number eighty-one which stated that, "The

Board was dissatisfied with my work." Regarding the last factor it might be expected that teachers would be reluctant to respond to an item which related to a low evaluation of their work. In all but one of the eight School Board Factors the response to the 'decided influence' was greater than that of the 'moderate influence' response category, whereas for the total number of factors the opposite occurred. It appears that whereas only thirty-one of the respondents indicated any individual School Board Factor as contributing to mobility, there seems to be a relatively large proportion of those respondents feeling quite definite about the school board influence on their leaving when considering the relatively large proportion in the 'decided influence' category.

The Training and Professional Factors ranged from factor forty-four to factor sixty-four with means of from 1.36 down to 1.25 respectively. Whereas none of these factors ranked among the top means, neither did any appear among the bottom eighteen means. Such Training and Professional Factors as "The school had a poor academic record," "The staff lacked interest in professional activities," and "Professional competence was not respected among staff members," received means of 1.36, 1.33, and 1.30 respectively.

The religious factor related to teacher participation in church affairs received a mean of 1.37, and ranked as factor forty-two. The remaining five religious factor means are dispersed throughout the bottom fifty per cent of the range presented in Table XVI (supra, pp. 65-66). Of the six religious factors, those ranked as forty-two, fifty-four, and sixty received many responses in the 'definite influence' and

'slight influence' scale categories, with few indicating 'moderate influence'. Several respondents, who indicated these factors as contributing forces to their mobility, critically commented on church interference in school activities, and the influence of church expectations on the role of the teacher in the school community.

Generally, then, a review of the factors presented individually in Table XVI indicates that Personal Factors, Factors related to Working Conditions, Community Factors, Economic Factors, and Pupil Factors in that order appear to dominate the factors in the top quartile. School Board Factors and Religious Factors tend to occupy the lower quartile of the range of means. To assist in establishing the relationship among the nine classifications of factors which appeared in the questionnaire, an analysis of the means of the groups of factors will now be presented.

Hypothesis 1.2: Certain groups of factors will be identified by respondents as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other groups of factors.

For the purpose of analyzing the data for Hypothesis 1.2, the total number of responses for all the factors in each group was calculated for each of the 'decided', 'moderate', 'slight', and 'no influence' categories. These were converted into percentage responses for each point on the response scale. The mean of the factor means was calculated for each group which resulted in a group mean. These means were then arranged in the order of size of means, and are presented along with the per cent responses in Table XVII. In order to compare the means of groups of factors 't' tests were calculated. The results of this analysis are reported under the heading Findings below.

In order to facilitate discussion of the findings (or results) related to Hypothesis 1.2, the groups of individual factors which were used in determining the group data of Table XVII were arranged in order of size of means, and are presented in Tables XVIII to XXVI.

Findings. Table XVII indicates that the group of personal factors with a mean of 1.68 and a group mean of 32 per cent of the respondents indicating the factors to have influenced mobility, appeared to have had the greatest influence on mobility, based on the instrument used in this study. When compared by the use of 't' tests, the mean of Personal Factors was significantly greater at or beyond the .05 level of confidence than all other group means presented in Table XVII. Pupil Factors, Community Factors, Economic Factors, and Factors related to Working Conditions follow in that order, although there is relatively little difference among the overall means with a small range of from a high of 1.50 to a low of 1.45. Administrative Factors ranked fifth with a group mean of 1.32. School Board Factors, Training and Professional Factors, and Religious Factors with means of 1.30, 1.28, and 1.25 respectively, occupy positions seven, eight, and nine in the ranking presented in Table XVII.

Comparisons of the larger and smaller group means were made on the basis of 't' tests. It was found that each of the first four group means presented in Table XVII, namely, Personal, Pupil, Community, and Economic Factors, was significantly larger than each of the bottom four group means, namely, Administrative, School Board, Training and Professional, and Religious Factors. In all cases the differences were

TABLE XVII

DISTRIBUTION OF GROUPS OF FACTORS BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Group Identification	D	Per Cent		Responses ^a		Total	Mean
			M		S	N		
1.	Personal Factors	13.36	9.41		9.29	67.94	100.00	1.68
2.	Pupil Factors	7.43	6.39		14.98	71.20	100.00	1.50
3.	Community Factors	6.79	7.32		12.72	73.17	100.00	1.48
4.	Economic Factors	7.86	6.23		10.43	75.48	100.00	1.47
5.	Working Conditions	7.48	6.12		10.19	76.21	100.00	1.45
6.	Administrative Factors	3.89	4.38		11.30	80.43	100.00	1.32
7.	School Board Factors	4.78	3.46		8.43	83.33	100.00	1.30
8.	Training and Professional Factors	3.12	5.69		9.08	82.11	100.00	1.28
9.	Religious Factors	3.39	3.39		7.99	85.23	100.00	1.25
Group Mean		6.46	5.82		10.49	77.23	100.00	1.41

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence. The means of Factors related to Working Conditions was significantly larger than that of both Training and Professional and Religious Factors. No significant differences were found in comparisons made between Pupil, Community, Economic, and Working Conditions Factors. Similarly, Administrative, School Board, Training and Professional, and Religious Factors did not differ significantly when compared with each other.

Discussion. The group mean of the Personal Factors was 1.68, which represents a range in factor means of 1.20 to 2.42 on the seven factors (Table XVIII). It has been shown in Table XVI (supra, pp. 65-66) that five of these factors appeared among the top twenty means. Consequently, even though factor seven in Table XVIII has a mean of only 1.20, the overall mean for all the factors remains relatively high.

Table XIX indicates that the group mean of Pupil Factors is 1.50, which ranks second in the hierarchical arrangement (Table XVII). This represents a range in factor means of 1.34 to 1.73 (Table XIX), which is a relatively small range when considering that the total range of all factor means is from 1.05 to 2.42 (supra, Table XVI, pp. 65-66). Consequently, because none of the seven Pupil Factors deviate appreciably from the group mean, it may be suggested that this mean is representative of the particular group of factors in question.

Table XVI (supra, pp. 65-66) shows that ten of the fourteen Community Factor means ranked in the top fifty per cent of all the means. However, because of three very low means, namely, 1.22, 1.20, and 1.08 for factors twelve, thirteen, and fourteen respectively, as in Table XX,

TABLE XVIII
DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONAL AND FAMILY FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	I desired to broaden my experiences.	36	25	17	45	123	2.42
2.	I wanted to be nearer my home town or place of family residence.	21	16	9	77	123	1.85
3.	I just enjoy moving around.	13	16	23	71	123	1.76
4.	I wished to be closer to the university.	16	8	9	90	123	1.59
5.	I wished to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boyfriend's (girlfriend's) place of employment.	18	7	5	93	123	1.59
6.	The position offered little opportunity of meeting the opposite sex.	8	4	12	99	123	1.36
7.	Other members of my family wanted a move.	3	5	5	110	123	1.20
Group Mean		17	11	11	84	123	1.68

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XIX
DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	Pupils lacked a desire to learn, and had poor attitudes and study habits.	14	12	24	73	123	1.73
2.	There were too many low ability pupils to teach.	11	12	17	83	123	1.60
3.	Pupils were poorly prepared for the class I taught.	11	6	23	83	123	1.55
4.	There was too little relief from pupils during the day.	6	9	19	89	123	1.45
5.	Discipline was difficult to maintain.	9	4	16	94	123	1.41
6.	Pupils were too disrespectful.	9	6	12	96	123	1.41
7.	Pupils were difficult to understand and get along with.	4	6	18	95	123	1.34
Group Mean		9	8	18	88	123	1.50

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

the group mean is low. If, for example, the group mean were calculated for only thirteen items, omitting the factor related to free inquiry ($\bar{X}=1.08$), then it would be raised from 1.48 to 1.51, and would result in Community Factors receiving second position next to Personal Factors instead of the third position it now occupies.

Only six Economic Factors appeared on the questionnaire, and these received a range in means of from 1.30 to 1.59, resulting in a group mean of 1.47 (Table XXI). There appeared to be fairly consistent agreement among respondents regarding factors related to the cost of living, travelling, and rent as contributors to mobility, as evidenced by the similarity in the number of responses to 'decided influence' category on factors one, two, and three in Table XXI.

Factors related to Working Conditions ranked only fifth as a group when compared with other groups of factors (Table XVII). However, it was shown on Table XVI (supra, pp. 65-66) that five of the top twenty factors were classified as Working Conditions. This can be explained by considering that whereas there were several high factor means in the grouping, there were also several extremely low means. For example, factors related to class interruptions, non-teaching activities, and staff meetings (Table XXII) were among the bottom eight in the total range of factor means (supra, Table XVI, pp. 65-66). Consequently, when they were treated as a group the importance of several individual factors related to Working Conditions tended to be de-emphasized.

Administrative Factors as a group, with a range in means from 1.05 to 1.56, ranked sixth in relationship to other groups. Judging by

TABLE XX
DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate.	19	19	22	63	123	1.95
2.	The living and housing conditions were unsatisfactory for teachers.	17	16	9	81	123	1.75
3.	The community displayed a lack of interest in school affairs.	10	13	27	73	123	1.67
4.	The community offered inadequate material support for the school.	9	12	25	77	123	1.62
5.	Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family.	14	8	11	90	123	1.56
6.	The community where I taught last year was too isolated.	12	5	17	89	123	1.51
7.	The attitude existed in the community that teaching was an easy and trivial job.	4	9	27	83	123	1.46
8.	The socio-economic status of the community was low.	6	10	18	89	123	1.46
9.	The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of the teachers.	8	8	15	92	123	1.45
10.	Insufficient health services were available.	7	9	10	97	123	1.40
11.	The community was too small.	6	6	13	98	123	1.35
12.	Teachers were expected to show special favour to certain children of influential persons and/or groups.	2	4	13	104	123	1.22
13.	The attitude existed in the community that teachers were overpaid.	2	6	7	108	123	1.20
14.	The community's restriction on free inquiry in the classroom was unreasonable.	1	1	5	116	123	1.08
Group Mean		9	9	16	89	123	1.48

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XXI
DISTRIBUTION OF ECONOMIC FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a			N	Total	Mean
		D	M	S			
1.	The cost of travelling from the community where I taught last year to larger population centers was too high.	11	13	13	86	123	1.59
2.	The cost of living was too high in the community where I taught last year.	14	7	15	87	123	1.57
3.	The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high.	13	10	11	89	123	1.57
4.	There was little or no opportunity of getting a better paying position in my last school.	11	5	13	94	123	1.46
5.	The school board did not supplement teachers' incomes.	4	5	15	99	123	1.30
6.	Teachers' salaries were too low in comparison with other persons in the community.	5	6	10	102	123	1.30
Group Mean		10	8	13	92	123	1.47

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XXII

DISTRIBUTION OF FACTORS RELATED TO WORKING CONDITIONS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	Large classes made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	20	13	24	66	123	1.89
2.	A lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment existed.	14	16	27	66	123	1.82
3.	There were too many grades in one class.	18	10	11	84	123	1.69
4.	The future outlook for improvement in working conditions was too discouraging.	17	5	19	82	123	1.65
5.	There was lack of, or inadequate, janitorial service.	15	12	11	85	123	1.65
6.	The school building was in poor repair and inadequate.	14	5	14	90	123	1.54
7.	Sufficient time for planning, preparing and evaluating teaching activities was lacking.	8	12	14	89	123	1.50
8.	Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school.	8	11	9	95	123	1.45
9.	Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions, and control of pupils.	6	9	10	98	123	1.37
10.	There was lack of, or inadequate clerical assistance with routine clerical duties.	5	6	9	103	123	1.29
11.	The work load was too unevenly distributed among staff members.	5	4	10	104	123	1.27
12.	Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences.	4	4	7	108	123	1.22
13.	There were too many class interruptions.	2	3	4	114	123	1.18
14.	Too many non-teaching activities such as plays, athletics, clubs, etc. were required.	2	2	8	111	123	1.15
15.	Too many P. T. A.'s, staff meetings, workshops, and Teachers' Association meetings were required.	0	1	11	111	123	1.11
Group Mean		9	7	13	124	123	1.45

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

both the comments made by respondents throughout the questionnaires, and also the low mean on such factors as 'too many staff meetings', 'too many classroom visits', and 'too much inflexibility in supervision' (Table XXIII), it appears that it was the reverse of these factors which may have in part influenced certain teachers to become mobile. It must be stressed that those respondents who occupied administrative positions during the 1964-1965 school year were not included in the treatment of this group of factors. This might have affected the relationship between administrative factors and other factors when they were compared on the basis of individual and group means.

It appears that individual School Board Factors, which together had a group mean of 1.30 and ranked seventh in relationship to the other groups, are either moderately high or fairly low. For example, factor one related to encouraging teachers to remain on staff had a mean of 1.55, and factor two related to housing had a mean of 1.41, whereas five of the eight factors had means below 1.29 (Table XXIV). The group mean here, too, may not give a good indication of the relative importance of certain individual factors.

Training and Professional Factors, with the lowest range in means among all groups, from 1.25 to 1.36, ranked eighth among the group means presented in Table XVII (supra, p. 75). There appears to be little discrimination among individual factors in this group (Table XXV).

Religious Factors ranked last relative to the other groups with only fifteen per cent of the respondents indicating that these factors as a group influenced their mobility (Table XXVI). The low ranking of

TABLE XXIII
DISTRIBUTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	The administrative official(s) failed to offer leadership to help teachers solve their problems.	6	5	16	52	79	1.56
2.	The administrative official(s) failed to support teacher decisions, therefore breaking down staff coherence.	3	6	15	55	79	1.46
3.	Consistent adherence to established policies was not maintained by the administration.	2	8	11	58	79	1.42
4.	The administrative official(s) lacked consideration for staff members.	6	3	9	61	79	1.42
5.	The administrative official(s) chose to please pupils and parents at the expense of teachers.	5	3	9	62	79	1.38
6.	The administrative official(s) was/were unfriendly and unapproachable.	5	3	7	64	79	1.35
7.	Staff meetings were so controlled by the administration as not to allow for free staff participation.	4	5	6	64	79	1.35
8.	The administrative official(s) was/were unfair, and discriminated against certain staff members.	2	2	12	63	79	1.28
9.	The administrative official(s) failed to appreciate and praise desirable results produced by staff members.	2	3	10	64	79	1.28
10.	General supervision of school activities was too rigid, inflexible, and authoritative.	2	3	9	65	79	1.27
11.	Teachers were reprimanded by the administration in the presence of students.	3	1	3	72	79	1.18
12.	The administrative official(s) sought publicity and praise at the expense of the staff.	0	3	5	71	79	1.14
13.	There were too many classroom visits by administrative official(s).	0	0	4	75	79	1.05
Group Mean		3	3	9	64	79	1.32

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XXIV
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL BOARD FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to remain on its staff.	11	10	15	87	123	1.55
2.	The Board made little or no effort to provide or arrange for adequate housing for teachers.	10	4	13	96	123	1.41
3.	The Board was incompetent.	7	9	11	96	123	1.41
4.	The Board treated teachers unfairly.	6	4	10	103	123	1.29
5.	The Board officials interfered unnecessarily in the internal operation of the school.	4	3	11	105	123	1.24
6.	The Board treated teachers as inferior and non-professional personnel.	4	2	10	107	123	1.21
7.	Teacher conduct was too closely scrutinized by the Board.	3	2	12	106	123	1.20
8.	The Board was dissatisfied with my work.	2	0	1	120	123	1.06
Group Mean		6	4	10	103	123	1.30

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XXV
DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	The school had a poor academic record.	5	9	11	98	123	1.36
2.	The staff lacked interest in professional activities.	5	5	16	97	123	1.33
3.	Professional competence was not respected among staff members.	4	8	9	102	123	1.30
4.	At the level I was teaching, too wide a gap existed between the theory in the university courses and the school practices.	3	6	14	100	123	1.28
5.	I was required to teach subjects and/or grades which I was not trained to teach.	5	6	5	107	123	1.26
6.	Staff members made little effort to achieve high academic standards within the school.	1	8	12	102	123	1.25
Group Mean		4	7	11	101	123	1.28

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

TABLE XXVI
DISTRIBUTION OF RELIGIOUS FACTORS
BY SIZE OF MEANS

Number	Factor	Responses ^a				Total	Mean
		D	M	S	N		
1.	Teachers were expected to be very active in church activities.	8	5	12	98	123	1.37
2.	Participation in and contribution to church activities were over-emphasized in evaluating teacher effectiveness in teaching.	6	4	10	103	123	1.29
3.	The church interfered with the internal operation of the school.	6	3	10	104	123	1.28
4.	The teachers were expected to teach religion in the school.	3	4	9	107	123	1.21
5.	The community exerted unnecessary restriction on the religious life of the teachers.	1	5	10	107	123	1.19
6.	There was too much religious prejudice in the community.	1	4	8	110	123	1.15
Group Mean		4	4	10	105	123	1.25

^aD: Decided influence; M: Moderate influence; S: Slight influence; N: No influence.

the group of Religious Factors may be partly a reflection of the fact that several of these factors were related mainly to selected communities, for example, the smaller communities, and therefore were not generally applicable to all Newfoundland teaching situations.

Summary and Conclusions

Tables XVI and XVII presented a distribution of individual factors and groups of factors respectively ranked in the order of the size of means. Using the magnitude of the means and 't' tests as criteria for determining differences among means, it may be concluded that Hypothesis 1 was supported, that is, that teachers identify certain factors and groups of factors as having a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors. However, when treating the factors in groups (supra, Table XVII, p. 75), the incidence of extremely low means, as in Working Conditions (supra, Table XXII, p. 82), or the absence of factors tending to deviate appreciably from the mean, as in Pupil Factors (supra, Table XIX, p. 78), might tend to misrepresent the relationship of the groups to each other. Also, treating factors as a group tends to discount the importance of what might be the significant individual factors. It might therefore be concluded that treating factors in groups, as was done in this chapter, is not a very useful procedure; consequently, factor group scores will not be used in testing the remaining hypotheses. Instead, subsequent analyses will examine individual factors as they relate to such variables as sex, teacher training and experience, and school and community size. Chapter VI which follows attempts to compare respondents on a number of such selected variables.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

1. Blocker, C. E., and R. C. Richardson. "Twenty-five Years of Morale Research: a Critical Review," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXVI (January, 1963), 208.
2. Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), 127-132.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, SCHOOL SIZE, AND COMMUNITY SIZE

The major purpose of this chapter is to present Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5 which have been stated in Chapter III, and discuss the related findings.

In general, it is hypothesized that respondents classified on certain selected variables will differ significantly in their responses to the factors identified in the questionnaire used in this study. The statistical procedures used in testing the various hypotheses were 't' tests or analyses of covariance. The level of significance was set a priori at .05. In establishing this level the writer was guided by Selltitz, et al., who claim that in the social sciences it is more or less conventional to accept the hypothesis when the statistical analysis indicates that the observed difference would not occur more than 5 times out of 100 by chance alone.¹ In testing each hypothesis, although tests of differences have been used for all eighty-two identified factors, only factors with significant differences are reported in this chapter. Appendix B gives a more complete presentation of the findings related to the various hypotheses.

¹Selltitz, C. et al., Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), p. 418.

I. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Hypothesis 2 states that teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. To test this hypothesis respondents were classified by sex, years of professional preparation, and years of teaching experience. The results of the analyses for each of these three variables are presented separately under hypotheses 2.1 to 2.3 below.

Hypothesis 2.1: Teachers classified on the basis of sex differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

In testing this hypothesis the sample was divided on the basis of sex, and 't' tests were used to test the differences between male and female respondents on each of the eighty-two factors.

Findings. Significant differences were found between male and female teachers on thirteen of the eighty-two factors identified in the Teacher Mobility Questionnaire (Appendix A). This number is much larger than would be expected purely by chance. A tabular presentation of all factor means together with other relevant data appears in Appendix B (p. 150). On twelve of the factor means which are presented in Table XXVII male respondents scored significantly higher than females. Most of the differences appear among Economic Factors, that is, factors 4, 5, 6, and 7 in Table XXVII, and in all cases the men scored significantly higher means than women. It is therefore concluded that hypothesis 2.1 is supported, that is, teachers classified by sex differed in their responses to individual factors.

TABLE XXVII

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SEX

Factor	Male ^a		Female ^b		Level of Significance
	\bar{X}		\bar{X}	't'	
1. The community where I taught last year was too isolated.	1.71		1.30	2.437	.05
2. The community was too small.	1.52		1.17	2.566	.05
3. Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family.	1.75		1.37	2.062	.05
4. The cost of living was too high in the community where I taught last year.	1.78		1.37	2.262	.05
5. The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high.	1.79		1.33	2.545	.05
6. The school board did not supplement teachers' incomes.	1.46		1.13	2.651	.01
7. There was little or no opportunity of getting a better paying position in my last school.	1.63		1.27	2.220	.05
8. I wished to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boyfriend's (girlfriend's) place of employment.	1.30		1.90	3.077	.01
9. The church interfered with the internal operation of the school.	1.43		1.12	2.385	.05
10. Participation in and contribution to church activities were over-emphasized in evaluating teacher effectiveness in teaching.	1.44		1.13	2.327	.05
11. The Board was incompetent.	1.60		1.20	2.672	.01
12. The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to remain on its staff.	1.76		1.33	2.483	.05
13. There was lack of, or inadequate clerical assistance with routine clerical duties.	1.54		1.03	4.000	.001
<hr/>					
^a Male N = 63		^b Female N = 60			

Discussion. It was found that male respondents indicated the first seven factors presented in Table XXVII as having a significantly greater influence on their mobility than did females. These factors generally relate to the inadequate community educational facilities, the general economic conditions such as cost of living and cost of rent, and also isolation. Considering the fact that sixty per cent of the total number of males used in this treatment are married as compared with only twenty-two per cent of the female respondents, and while remembering that married males probably provide the major means of economic livelihood in most families, it might be reasonable for the males to be more mobile prone because of such factors as inadequate educational facilities and the high cost of living.

Several women indicated they moved because of the husband being transferred to another job location. This probably accounts for the female respondents having a significantly higher mean than male respondents on the factor related to place of employment of spouse.

On both Religious Factors, numbers nine and ten in Table XXVII, males scored higher than females. This might be expected when considering that in many Newfoundland communities male teachers especially are expected to assume such ecclesiastical responsibilities as lay reading, and the keeping of church records. Male respondents also appear more prone to change teaching positions because of Board Factors, as are shown by the difference appearing in factors eleven and twelve. However, thirty-eight of the sixty-three male respondents occupied administrative positions in 1964-1965 as compared with only ten of the sixty females (supra, Table XIV, p. 59). Consequently, it may be generalized that many male

respondents work in closer proximity to the board than most females, and thus might be affected to a greater extent by board policies and expectations.

The difference between males and females related to inadequate clerical assistance found on factor thirteen shows the highest 't' value obtained in testing hypothesis 2.1 ('t' = 4.00). This, too, might be partly explained by the fact that many males occupied administrative positions, and thus would expect, and perhaps require, clerical assistance. Also, it might be reasonable to assume that females are less unwilling to assume the responsibility for routine clerical duties.

Hypothesis 2.2: Teachers classified on the basis of professional preparation differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

In testing this hypothesis the total sample was divided into two groups based on years of professional preparation. Group one included all respondents with one year of professional preparation, and group two was composed of respondents with beyond one year of preparation. Because group one was composed mainly of female respondents, and because significant sex differences were found under hypothesis 2.1 (supra, Table XXVII, p. 92), an analysis of covariance with sex covaried was used in the present treatment in an effort to partial out the effect of the sex variable. The results of the findings with related discussion are presented below.

Findings. Table XXVIII presents the factors with significant differences between the means of respondents classified by years of professional preparation. Of the eighty-two factors significant differences

TABLE XXVIII

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Number	Factor	Professional Preparation			Adj. ^a F	Level of Significance
		1 year \bar{X}	1 year \bar{X}	N		
1.	The administrative official(s) lacked consideration for staff members.	1.13	1.57	37	42	7.54
2.	Teachers were reprimanded by the administration in the presence of students.	1.03	1.21	37	42	5.32
3.	Staff meetings were so controlled by the administration as not to allow for free staff participation.	1.11	1.57	37	42	7.38
4.	The socio-economic status of the community was low.	1.67	1.27	57	66	7.97
5.	Insufficient health services were available.	1.54	1.27	57	66	4.43
6.	The position offered little opportunity of meeting the opposite sex.	1.56	1.18	57	66	5.17
7.	There were too many low ability pupils to teach.	1.79	1.44	57	66	4.68
8.	Pupils were poorly prepared for the class I taught.	1.77	1.36	57	66	7.68
9.	The school had a poor academic record.	1.51	1.23	57	66	5.40
10.	There were too many grades in one class.	2.11	1.33	57	66	22.44
11.	Large classes made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	2.16	1.67	57	66	7.33
12.	A lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment existed.	1.95	1.71	57	66	4.01
13.	The work load was too unevenly distributed among staff members.	1.09	1.42	57	66	7.13

^a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by professional preparation with sex covaried.

were found on thirteen with teachers having one year of preparation scoring higher means on nine of these factors. Because the level of significance for this study was set at .05, which permits only four differences by chance, the conclusion is that respondents classified by professional preparation differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Discussion. The first three factors presented in Table XXVIII relate to the administrative official(s) being too autocratic and inconsiderate in their dealings with teachers. In all cases the respondents with more professional preparation indicated these factors as having a significantly greater influence on their mobility than did teachers with one year of preparation. Most of the teachers who commented critically throughout the questionnaire on undesirable administrative behaviour were among the teachers with the most years of professional preparation. Typically, these teachers complained that they were treated as non-professional personnel by the administration of their particular school. It appears, then, that the more trained teacher would expect to be treated more on an equal basis with the administration, whereas the younger, less qualified teacher, in terms of training, would be more willing to become subservient to his superordinate. Another explanation of this finding lies in the fact that a slight majority of the teachers with one year of preparation, unlike those of beyond two years, come from the smaller school (1-9 teachers), where there might be a closer personal relationship between principal and teacher than might be found in the larger school.

Factor four relates to the social life of communities from which teachers moved, and, as might be expected, the factor means of respondents who have one year of professional preparation and who are mainly young and single are higher than are those of respondents with beyond one year of preparation. The latter are generally married and have more years of teaching experience. This reasoning might be used to explain why, on factor six related to meeting the opposite sex, those with one year of training scored the higher means.

Factors seven to twelve inclusive relate generally to pupil ability, pupil preparedness, number of grades per classroom, and class size. On all of these factors the respondents classified with less professional preparation scored higher means. It appears that the teacher with more training might be more capable of dealing with situations mentioned in these factors, especially in relation to factor ten, namely, 'number of classes per grade' (Adj. $F=22.44$). A further explanation lies in the fact that slightly more of the teachers with one year of training work in the smaller schools where such factors as described under seven to twelve might be more prevalent than in the larger schools.

Factor thirteen indicates that the higher trained teacher appears to be more sensitive to the distribution of the work load among staff members. Perhaps teachers with less professional preparation are not as cognizant of what might be considered an equitable distribution of the work load as are teachers with more training.

Hypothesis 2.3: Teachers classified on the basis of years of teaching experience differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

In testing hypothesis 2.3 the total number of respondents was

divided into two groups on the basis of one to three and beyond three years of teaching experience. In order to test the hypothesis, groups were compared by means of analysis of covariance with sex and professional preparation covaried. The results of the findings followed by related discussion are presented below.

Findings. Table XXIX presents the significant differences in factor means resulting from tests of differences between respondents classified by years of teaching experience. Of the eighty-two factors significant differences were found on seventeen with teachers with one to three years experience scoring significantly higher on all but one of the factors. The greatest number of differences, five in this case, occurred on Pupil Factors.

Discussion. The less experienced group of teachers are more critical of administrative behaviour in their indications of their reasons for being mobile. It appears that teachers with one to three years of experience are much more likely to leave a teaching position because the administration is unfriendly and unapproachable, and in general fails to offer leadership. An analysis of the comments made by these respondents shows that administrative behaviour is criticized for being either too rigid or too lax.

As might be expected on such factors as 'inadequate entertainment facilities' and 'enjoyment in moving around', the younger and less experienced teacher scored higher than the other group used in this comparison. Also, because a relatively larger per cent of the more experienced group are married, it seems natural that they would score

TABLE XXIX

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Factor	Teaching Experience		Adj. ^a F	Level of Significance
	1-3 yrs. \bar{X}	>3 yrs. \bar{X}		
1. The administrative official(s) was/were unfriendly and unapproachable.	1.68 31	1.15 48	11.03	.01
2. Administrative official(s) failed to offer leadership to help teachers solve their problems.	1.90 31	1.35 48	7.35	.01
3. The administrative official(s) failed to support teacher decisions, therefore breaking down staff coherence and co-operation.	1.65 31	1.33 48	5.90	.05
4. There were too many classroom visits by administrative official(s).	1.13 31	1.00 48	7.89	.01
5. Teachers were expected to show special favour to certain children of influential persons and/or groups.	1.46 41	1.10 82	10.96	.01
6. Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate.	2.24 41	1.80 82	4.40	.05
7. I desired to broaden my experiences.	2.88 41	2.19 82	9.81	.01
8. I just enjoy moving around.	2.07 41	1.61 82	4.46	.05
9. Other members of my family wanted a move.	1.02 41	1.28 82	4.13	.05
10. There was too little relief from pupils during the day.	1.66 41	1.34 82	4.29	.05
11. Pupils were too disrespectful.	1.73 41	1.26 82	7.37	.01
12. Discipline was difficult to maintain.	1.71 41	1.27 82	6.39	.05
13. There were too many low ability pupils to teach.	1.90 41	1.45 82	4.94	.05
14. Pupils were poorly prepared for the class I taught.	1.85 41	1.40 82	5.40	.05
15. Too many non-teaching activities such as plays, athletics, clubs, etc. were required.	2.27 41	1.71 82	5.70	.05

TABLE XXIX (continued)

Factor	Teaching Experience			Adj. ^a F	Level of Significance
	1-3 yrs. \bar{X}	N	>3 yrs. \bar{X}	N	
16. Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions, and control of pupils.	1.73	41	1.20	82	.001
17. Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school.	1.78	41	1.28	82	.01

^a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by teaching experience with sex and professional preparation covaried.

higher on factor nine, namely, "Other members of my family wanted a move."

On factors ten to fifteen inclusive related generally to the burden of a heavy work load, the less experienced teachers scored higher than the more experienced. This supports the assumption made under hypothesis 2.2 that the younger teacher would have more problems in dealing with factors related to pupil control in general (supra, p. 97). Also, this finding might partly be explained by the fact that a larger proportion of the less experienced teachers moved from the smaller schools where conditions described in factors ten to fifteen were more likely to exist.

On factors sixteen and seventeen related to policy and program development, the less experienced teacher also scored higher than the teacher with more years of teaching experience, both differences significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. It must be pointed out that many of the teachers with one to three years of experience were teaching for their first year in 1964-1965. It is suggested that the neophyte might tend to experience a measure of disillusionment and dissatisfaction if faced with a situation in which a conflict exists between his expectations and the actual practice in terms of decision making.

Summary and Conclusions

Hypothesis 2 stated that respondents classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to the individual factors identified in this study. In testing this hypothesis teachers were classified on the basis of sex, professional preparation, and years of teaching experience.

Significant differences were found between respondents classified by sex on thirteen of the eighty-two identified factors. Male respondents scored significantly higher on twelve of the thirteen means.

When teachers were compared on the basis of professional preparation significant differences were found on thirteen factors. Teachers with one year of preparation scored higher on nine of the thirteen means.

Significant differences were found between respondents classified by teaching experience on seventeen of the eighty-two factors. Teachers with one to three years of experience scored higher means on sixteen of these factors.

In conclusion, then, Hypothesis 2 was in general supported. Tests revealed significant differences on all three sub-hypotheses.

II. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Hypothesis 3 states that teachers classified on the basis of the school system from which they moved differ in their responses to individual factors. In testing this hypothesis respondents were divided into four groups according to the Amalgamated, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and United Church systems in which they were teaching in 1964-1965. A comparison of these four groups showed uneven distribution from group to group on the variables sex, school size, and community population from which respondents moved. Regarding the latter two variables, analysis of the personal and professional characteristics of respondents revealed that the majority of the Amalgamated teachers moved from larger schools and

communities, whereas the reverse was the situation in connection with the other three groups. Consequently, in order to partly control for these variables, it was decided to use an analysis of covariance with all three variables covaried, even though respondents had not been compared on the basis of school size and community population.

Because the numbers in the Salvation Army and Pentecostal groups were under five, these two groups were eliminated from this part of the analyses.

Findings. The results of tests of differences between the four groups compared in Hypothesis 3 are presented in Table XXX. Six of the eighty-two 'F' tests were significant at the .05 level. The pairs between which differences existed on each of the six factors were identified by means of 't' tests. It was found that no one pair differed significantly on more than four factors. For example, when the Roman Catholic respondents were paired with Amalgamated respondents, significant 't' values were obtained on four factors. On all other paired comparisons fewer than four significant 't' values were found.

Discussion. The above findings show that, whereas six overall 'F' ratios were found when respondents were compared on the basis of school system, nevertheless, four or fewer differences existed when each group was compared with every other group on these six factors. Paired comparisons revealed, for example, that Roman Catholic respondents scored significantly higher than all other groups on the factor related to being closer to university. Similarly, Roman Catholic respondents scored the

TABLE XXX

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Factor	Amal. ^a		Ang.		R. C.		U. C.		Adj. ^b F	Level of Significance
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N		
1. The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers.	1.13	23	1.39	36	1.84	38	1.25	20	3.40	.05
2. Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family.	1.17	23	1.64	36	1.84	38	1.25	20	2.77	.05
3. The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high.	2.17	23	1.50	36	1.45	38	1.20	20	3.48	.05
4. I wished to be closer to the university.	1.26	23	1.50	36	2.08	38	1.35	20	4.89	.01
5. I desired to broaden my experiences.	1.87	23	2.36	36	2.84	38	2.45	20	3.45	.05
6. Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences.	1.26	23	1.11	36	1.45	38	1.00	20	3.70	.05

^a

Amal. Amalgamated
Ang. Anglican
R.C. Roman Catholic
U.C. United Church

^b

Adjusted F ratio resulting from an analysis of covariance by school systems with sex, school size, and community population covaried.

highest mean on factor five, namely, "I desired to broaden my experiences." It is concluded, nevertheless, that these and similar differences are perhaps impossible to interpret on the basis of the data used in this study.

Conclusion

Hypothesis 3 stated that respondents classified by school system differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. Although six overall differences were found using analysis of covariance, differences existed between each of the paired comparisons on four or fewer factors. It was concluded, however, that in general Hypothesis 3 was supported.

IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

Hypothesis 4 states that teachers classified on the basis of the number of teachers in the school from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. For the purpose of testing this hypothesis the total number of respondents was divided into two groups of one to nine and beyond nine teachers, and 't' tests were used to compare them. No differences existed between the two groups in terms of the distribution of the respondents on the variables of sex, experience, and professional preparation when using chi square in making the comparison. Consequently, no effort was made to control for these variables. The results of the group comparisons with related discussion are presented below.

Findings. Table XXXI indicates that significant differences were found on seventeen factors when respondents from one to nine and beyond nine teacher schools were compared. On twelve of these factors respondents from one to nine teacher schools scored significantly higher means. The major areas of difference relate to working conditions, the school community, and in general the cost of living.

Discussion. An analysis of the findings related to Hypothesis 4 indicates that teachers from schools of from one to nine teachers scored significantly higher means on factors related to working conditions and such community factors as restrictions on their personal and social lives, inadequate entertainment and recreational facilities, and lack of parental interest in education. On the other hand, on such economic factors as cost of rent, low teachers' salaries relative to other persons in the community, and cost of living in general, teachers from the schools with more than nine teachers obtained the higher means. From these findings and also from the comments made throughout the questionnaire, it appears that the major areas of contention of the teacher from the smaller school relates to large class size, inadequate teaching aids, and services. Generally, these factors are subsumed under Working Conditions. Perhaps these findings help to explain the conclusion reached in Chapter IV (supra, p. 54), namely, that teachers tend to gravitate from the smaller to the larger schools.

Conclusion

Hypothesis 4 stated that respondents classified by school size

TABLE XXXI

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SIZE^a

Factor	School Size				N	't'	Level of Significance
	1-9 teachers		>9 teachers				
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N			
1. The administrative official(s) was/were unfair, and discriminated against certain staff members.	1.12	42	1.46	37	2.435	.05	
2. Staff meetings were so controlled by the administration as not to allow for free staff participation.	1.12	42	1.62	37	2.850	.01	
3. The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers.	1.54	83	1.20	40	2.073	.05	
4. The community displayed a lack of interest in school affairs.	1.84	83	1.40	40	2.388	.05	
5. The socio-economic status of the community was low.	1.55	83	1.20	40	2.251	.05	
6. The community offered inadequate material support for the school.	1.71	83	1.35	40	2.081	.05	
7. The community was too small.	1.45	83	1.05	40	2.554	.05	
8. Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate.	2.04	83	1.57	40	2.079	.05	
9. Insufficient health services were available.	1.46	83	1.10	40	2.203	.05	
10. The cost of living was too high in the community where I taught last year.	1.27	83	2.13	40	4.552	.001	
11. The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high.	1.31	83	1.95	40	3.271	.01	
12. Teachers' salaries were too low in comparison with other persons in the community.	1.16	83	1.50	40	2.329	.05	
13. There were too many grades in one class.	1.99	83	1.05	40	4.722	.001	
14. Large classes made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance.	2.05	83	1.57	40	2.196	.05	

TABLE XXI (continued)

Factor	School Size				N	't'	Level of Significance
	1-9 teachers \bar{X}	10-19 teachers \bar{X}	20-29 teachers \bar{X}	30-39 teachers \bar{X}			
15. A lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment existed.	1.94	83	1.47	40	2.379	.05	
16. The future outlook for improvement in working conditions was too discouraging.	1.84	83	1.27	40	2.817	.01	
17. There was lack of, or inadequate, janitorial assistance.	1.81	83	1.25	40	2.810	.01	

differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. Significant differences were found on seventeen factors with teachers from the smaller schools scoring higher means on twelve items. The conclusion was that Hypothesis 4 was supported.

IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Hypothesis 5 states that teachers classified on the basis of the size of the community from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. This hypothesis attempts to explore earlier findings related to the gravitation of teachers towards larger population centers (supra, Table VIII, p. 50). In testing this hypothesis respondents from communities of less than one thousand population were compared with those of one thousand and beyond. The groups were compared by the use of analysis of covariance with sex and school size covaried. The findings and related discussion are presented below.

Findings. When teachers from the smaller communities were compared with those from the larger communities, significant differences were found on ten of the eighty-two factor means (Table XXXII). On all ten of these factors respondents from the smaller population centers scored the higher means. As might be expected, the major area in which differences occurred related to Community Factors, an area in which seven of the ten differences were found.

Discussion. As was mentioned above seven of the ten differences

TABLE XXXII

FACTORS WITH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY
POPULATION OF 1964-1965 SCHOOL COMMUNITY

Factor	Population				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
	<1000	\bar{X}	N	≥ 1000		
1. The administrative official(s) chose to please pupils and parents at the expense of teachers.	1.83	18	1.26	58	7.32	.01
2. The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers.	1.82	47	1.20	72	8.87	.01
3. Teachers were expected to show special favour to certain children of influential persons and/or groups.	1.36	47	1.13	72	6.27	.05
4. The attitude existed in the community that teaching was an easy and trivial job.	1.70	47	1.32	72	3.97	.05
5. The community was too small.	1.70	47	1.14	72	5.84	.05
6. Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate.	2.43	47	1.63	72	7.31	.01
7. Insufficient health services were available.	1.83	47	1.14	72	12.10	.001
8. Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family.	1.91	47	1.33	72	4.80	.05
9. The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to remain on its staff.	1.89	47	1.36	72	4.40	.05
10. The school had a poor academic record.	1.64	47	1.19	72	4.75	.05

^a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by population with sex and school size covaried.

found in relation to Hypothesis 5 were on Community Factors. Such factors as 'restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers', 'inadequate entertainment and recreational facilities', and 'insufficient health services' showed teachers from smaller communities with significantly higher means than teachers of larger communities all beyond the .05 level of confidence. It appears that the nature of the smaller community tends to have a greater influence on teacher mobility than the larger community, where using the Community Factors identified in this study as the point of comparison. These factors suggest areas in which attention might be given by persons concerned with teacher mobility if the exodus from the smaller communities mentioned earlier (supra, p. 48) is to be reduced.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above findings it is concluded that teachers do differ significantly in their responses to individual factors when classified by size of community. Respondents from the smaller communities, when compared with teachers from larger communities, were more critical of health services, entertainment facilities, and recreational facilities in their former communities.

V. SUMMARY

In this chapter four hypotheses were tested in order to ascertain whether respondents classified by certain selected variables differ in their responses to the individual factors identified in this study.

Results of Tests of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that teachers classified by personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to individual factors. In testing this hypothesis respondents were compared on the basis of sex, professional preparation, and teaching experience.

Teachers classified by sex differed significantly on thirteen factor responses. When teachers were compared on the basis of professional preparation again significant differences occurred on thirteen factors. Finally, teachers compared by years of teaching experience differed significantly on seventeen of the eighty-two factors. It was concluded on the basis of these three sub hypotheses that teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differed significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Results of Tests of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that teachers classified by the school system from which they moved differed significantly in their responses to individual factors. This hypothesis was in general supported.

Results of Tests of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that teachers classified by size of school differed significantly in their responses to individual factors. The number of teachers on staff in each school was used as an index of school size. Seventeen differences occurred when teachers of one to nine and beyond nine teacher schools were compared. It was therefore concluded

that Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Results of Tests of Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that respondents classified on the basis of community population differed significantly in their responses to individual factors. Significant differences were found on ten of the eighty-two factors. It was concluded that Hypothesis 5 was supported.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER VI

1. Selltiz , C., et al.. Research Methods in Social Relations.
New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the problem of excessive teacher mobility among certificated teachers in the province of Newfoundland. Specifically, the research was designed to ascertain the major reasons why certificated teachers elected to move from the schools in which they were teaching during the school year 1964-1965 to other schools in the same province for the school year 1965-1966. From the sub problems five hypotheses were set forward for the present study as follows:

- Hypothesis 1: Teachers will identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors.
- Hypothesis 2: Teachers classified on the basis of personal and professional characteristics differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.
- Hypothesis 3: Teachers classified on the basis of the school system from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.
- Hypothesis 4: Teachers classified on the basis of the number of teachers in the school from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.
- Hypothesis 5: Teachers classified on the basis of the size of community from which they moved differ significantly in their responses to individual factors.

Hypothesis 1 was concerned essentially with identifying the relative degree to which selected factors and groups of factors correlate with

teacher mobility in Newfoundland.

In testing Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5 an attempt was made to ascertain whether teachers, classified on the bases of such selected variables as sex, years of professional preparation, years of teaching experience, school system, school size and community size, differed in their responses to individual factors identified in this study.

Instrumentation and Methodology

Based on the literature in the field of teacher mobility, a questionnaire was constructed which included a number of items found in related research. As a result of suggestions made by the writer's thesis committee members and those of several Newfoundland teachers conversant with the Newfoundland teaching situation, eighty-two factors were finally adapted and adopted for use in the present study. These factors were grouped under nine sub headings as follows:

- A. Administrative Factors
- B. Community Factors
- C. Economic Factors
- D. Personal and Family Factors
- E. Pupil Factors
- F. Religious Factors
- G. School Board Factors
- H. Training and Professional Factors
- I. Working Conditions

Responses from the teachers were elicited by means of a four

point Likert-type scale. Specifically, respondents were asked to identify each of the eighty-two factors by D, M, S, or N corresponding respectively to 'decided', 'moderate', 'slight', or 'no influence' in terms of their mobility. Means were calculated for each factor using 4, 3, 2, and 1 weightings for D, M, S, and N respectively.

In testing Hypothesis 1 the means on each factor and group of factors were used as criteria for arranging the factors in order of their importance. It was assumed that the higher the mean the greater the correlation with mobility.

In treating Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5, 't' tests and analyses of covariance were used to test the differences between or among the means of respondents classified by the selected variables mentioned in these hypotheses.

Demographic data were collected by means of questions related to the personal and professional characteristics of respondents.

The Sample

A random sample of 194 of the 651 teachers who had moved to new schools in 1965-1966 was selected for participation in this study. This sample was stratified by sex and by school system. Of the 140 questionnaires that arrived before March 30, the cut-off date, 123 were usable. The remainder were discarded because of incomplete data, or because respondents had not been teaching during the whole school year of 1964-1965.

Results

Hypothesis 1 stated that teachers will identify certain factors

and groups of factors as having been a greater influence in terms of their mobility than other factors and groups of factors. In the treatment of this hypothesis means were calculated from the numbers 4, 3, 2, and 1, which were assigned respectively to 'decided influence', 'moderate influence', 'slight influence', and 'no influence' response categories. Whereas the possible range in factor means was from 1 to 4, the actual range was from 1.05 to 2.42. When the factors were treated individually, those related to personal factors, working conditions, the community, and economic conditions dominated the top quartile of factor means. Training and religious factors generally were found among the smaller means.

The following is the order in which the group factors appeared when they were hierarchically arranged by size of group means: (1) Personal Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.68$; (2) Pupil Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.50$; (3) Community Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.48$; (4) Economic Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.47$; (5) Working Conditions-- $\bar{X} = 1.45$; (6) Administrative Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.32$; (7) School Board Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.30$; (8) Training and Professional Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.28$; (9) Religious Factors-- $\bar{X} = 1.25$.

Based on the magnitude of the factor and group means, and also on the results of 't' tests used to compare the larger and smaller means, it was concluded that Hypothesis 1 was supported.

It was observed that the treatment of factors in groups tended to de-emphasize the importance of certain individual factors in particular groups. For this reason, in the remainder of the study only individual factor means were used in the treatment of the various hypotheses.

Hypothesis 2, that respondents classified on the basis of personal

and professional characteristics differ in their responses to individual factors, was supported. Statistical tests performed in connection with this hypothesis revealed that significant differences in response means occurred between respondents on the following comparisons:

1. Male and female respondents were significantly different in their responses to thirteen of the eighty-two factors.
2. Respondents with one and beyond one year of professional preparation differed significantly on thirteen factors.
3. Teachers with one to three and beyond three years of teaching experience differed on seventeen of the eighty-two factors.

Hypothesis 3, that respondents classified by the school system from which they moved differ in their responses to individual factors, was supported.⁴ Specifically, significant 'F' ratios were found on six of the eighty-two factors when Amalgamated, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and United Church respondents were compared.

Hypothesis 4, that respondents classified by size of school differ in their responses to individual factors, was accepted. Significant differences were found on seventeen factors when teachers of one to nine and beyond nine teacher schools were compared.

Hypothesis 5 stated that respondents classified on the basis of the community population differed significantly in their responses to individual factors. Significant differences were found on ten of the eighty-two factors. It was concluded that Hypothesis 5 was supported.

In the treatment of a number of the above hypotheses, analyses of covariance was used in an effort to partial out the effect of certain

variables. For example, sex was covaried in Hypotheses 2.2, 2.3, 3, and 5.

In summary, then, it was discovered in testing Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5 that respondents differed significantly in their responses to individual factors when classified by sex, by amount of professional preparation, by years of teaching experience, by the school systems from which they moved, by school size where they taught, and by the population of the community where their former school was located.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Several points follow which should be remembered when interpreting the conclusions and implications of this study:

1. The conclusions and implications presented below are based on responses to individual factors, statistical comparisons between various classifications of respondents, and comments offered by respondents.

2. The measurement instrument used in this study may not have adequately measured certain factors that might correlate with mobility, and it may have omitted some factors completely.

3. Although the estimates of the sample selected for use in this study approximate the parameters of the total teacher population, it must be remembered that much less than one hundred per cent of the selected sample has been used in this study.

4. An attempt is made to present an assessment of only the major findings with related implications.

5. The conclusions and implications may apply only for the period under question in the present study.

Conclusion 1

Many of the findings in this study do not parallel the results of research reported in related literature. For example, although 'administrative factors' were identified in related literature as a major cause of mobility, this study reveals that several other groups of factors appear to take precedence.

Implication. This finding suggests that the differences between the Newfoundland educational system and that of many geographical areas in which similar research has been conducted might be sufficient to account for the variations in findings. The implication is that persons concerned with the problem of excessive teacher mobility should exercise caution in attempting to explain their mobility problems in terms of research done in other geographical locations.

Conclusion 2

Teacher mobility is neither totally controllable nor necessarily precipitated by an undesirable situation. For example, factors such as "I desired to broaden my experiences," and "I just enjoy moving around," correlate highly with mobility when compared with the total number of factors identified in this study. These factors were mainly selected by younger, less experienced teachers. This adds support to the theory that certain teachers are characteristically 'turnover prone'.¹

¹W. W. Charters, Jr., "What Causes Teacher Turnover?", School Review, LXIV (October, 1956), p. 298.

Implication. Persons concerned with teacher mobility might, under certain circumstances, accept it as a natural occurrence. Also, staffs with a preponderance of younger teachers might expect a higher rate of mobility.

Conclusion 3

The decision by a teacher to leave a teaching position is generally influenced by a multiplicity of factors. In the present study only five of the one hundred twenty-three respondents selected a single factor as the cause of their mobility. Frequently, twenty or more factors were identified by teachers as contributors to their mobility.

Implication. Those concerned with teacher mobility should consider the total setting in which teachers work if steps are to be taken to reduce the problem.

Conclusion 4

The multiple causes of teacher mobility will vary with the personal and professional characteristics of respondents, the school system, and the size of school and school community. This study revealed significant differences in teacher responses to individual factors when they were classified and compared on the bases of such selected variables as sex, years of professional preparation and training, school system, and size of school and community.

Implication. There is no universally applicable solution to the problem of mobility. Efforts to remedy an existing mobility problem will vary with the situation and the individual teachers concerned.

Conclusion 5

Many factors which influence teacher mobility are at least partially controllable. A major area which appeared to have had an effect on mobility and which may be partly remedied relates to working conditions, especially in connection with the smaller school and community. Too many grades in one class, large classes, buildings in poor repair, and a lack of or inadequate teaching aids, materials, janitorial services, and clerical assistance were among the factors receiving the highest ratings in this study. Most of the comments made by respondents in connection with their mobility from former schools related to these factors.

Implication. If teacher mobility, especially from the smaller community, is to be reduced, then improvements must be made in the conditions under which teachers work. Perhaps this above finding also lends support to a continuation of the policy of central and regional schools in Newfoundland. It is further implied that centralization of elementary schools might be a desirable extension of the present policies of reorganization, if these reorganizations make possible improvements in working conditions.

Conclusion 6

Although Administrative Factors ranked low in this study in relation to other factors, nevertheless, administrative behaviour varying from too lax to too rigid in terms of supervision was identified as an area which had an impact on teachers' decisions to become mobile. The criticism that the administrator failed to offer sufficient leadership in helping

teachers solve their problems was most frequently made by the younger, less experienced teacher. The more experienced and better qualified teacher was more critical of administrative behaviour that was too rigid and inflexible.

Implication. It must be recognized that the school administrator, through improvements in his own leader behaviour, can reduce excessive mobility under certain circumstances. The administrator might take a more active part in assisting the younger teacher with problems related to pupil control and heavy work load--areas that appeared from this study to be highly correlated with mobility on the part of the less experienced teacher. On the other hand, more experienced teachers, especially those who have had several years of professional preparation, should be permitted more professional freedom in planning and conducting their teaching affairs. In general, the school administrator should be aware of differing expectations held for him by the members of his teaching staff.

Conclusion 7

Teachers in the larger population centers, especially married males, indicated that economic circumstances related to high cost of living accommodations and the generally high cost of living influenced their mobility. This is generally not the case in the smaller community.

Implication. This finding suggests that if boards in larger population centers, where mobility is a problem, want to increase the probability of retaining staff, then consideration might be given to a system of bonuses as a supplement to the provincial salary schedule.

Alternately, when considering the fact that 77 of the 123 respondents received salaries less than \$3500 in their former schools (supra, Table V, p. 46), perhaps substantial readjustments in the provincial salary scale are necessary.

Conclusion 8

Parental attitudes towards education in general and teachers in particular affect teacher mobility. Specifically, this study revealed that lack of parental interest in education and excessive parental criticism of teacher behaviour are areas of concern especially among younger teachers.

Implication. It is suggested that a planned public relations effort, with well defined lines of communication between the school and the public, might serve to awaken parental interest in and appreciation of education in areas where the problem of parental apathy towards education exists. Perhaps administrative officials in school communities where this situation exists could best co-ordinate any such concerted public relations effort. Perhaps, also, schools in certain areas are not meeting the needs of the children, and hence parental criticism might be justified. This would suggest some form of school reorganization which might be initiated at the provincial level.

Conclusion 9

School boards could assist in retaining staff members if they made an effort to encourage teachers to remain on staff. Approximately thirty per cent of the total number of teachers participating in this study

gave as one of the reasons why they left their former schools the fact that the board made little or no effort to encourage them to remain.

Implication. This suggests that school boards should make an effort, perhaps through personal contact or written correspondence, to encourage teachers whom they wish to retain on staff to do so. It is further suggested that boards conduct exit interviews with teachers in an effort to reveal any existing areas of dissatisfaction. Information thus gathered might form the basis for remedial action.

Conclusion 10

Expectations for teachers to be very active in church activities, together with over-emphasis on teacher participation in and contribution to church activities in evaluating teacher effectiveness have an effect on teacher mobility. In this regard over twenty per cent of the teachers involved in this study indicated such religious factors as contributors to their mobility.

Implication. It is suggested that teachers ought to have the freedom of choice without reprimand of becoming involved in church activities. It appears that certain teachers, at least, feel that involvement expected of teachers by the community and board and church leaders in activities outside their field of teacher specialization is an encroachment on their private lives. Otherwise, persons responsible for teacher recruitment might specify such expected involvement at the time of hiring, and thereby possibly reduce the degree of dissatisfaction that might otherwise result after a position had been accepted.

Implications for Further Research

This study revealed that the causes of teacher mobility vary appreciably from area to area. The suggestion is, then, that replication of this type of research might be desirable in an attempt to explain the reasons for teacher mobility in any other area. However, any similar effort should attempt to validate through an extensive pilot study the instrument used in this thesis or some other similar instrument. Perhaps, factor analysis might be used to help in establishing certain dimensions of teacher mobility. It is further suggested that subsequent research in the field of teacher mobility might attempt to statistically arrange the factors in the order in which they correlate with mobility. Perhaps some form of multiple regression might be a desirable procedure in so arranging factors. This presupposes, however, a pilot study and perhaps factor analysis as are mentioned above.

Concluding Statement

This study then, suggests two general conclusions as follows:

(1) teachers did identify certain factors and groups of factors as having had a greater influence on their mobility than other factors and groups of factors, and (2) teachers, when compared on certain selected variables, differed in their responses to individual factors, regarding the effect that these factors had on their decisions to move from their former schools. It is hoped that some light has been shed on the problem of teacher mobility in Newfoundland, and that remedial action may be based on a number of findings resulting from this investigation.

REFERENCE FOR CHAPTER VII

1. Charters, Jr., W. W. "What Causes Teacher Turnover?", School Review, LXIV (October, 1956), 298.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Argyris, C. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill and Company Incorporated, 1959.
- Frecker, A. Education in the Atlantic Provinces. Toronto: Gage and Company Limited, 1957.
- Guba, Egon G., and Charles E. Bidwell. A Study of the School as a Social Institution: Administrative Relationships, Teacher Effectiveness, Teacher Satisfaction, and Administrative Behaviour. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1947.
- Herzberg, F., B. Mauser, and B. B. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1959.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Mayo, Elton. The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization. Massachusetts: Andover Press, 1945.
- _____. The Human Problems of an Industrial Organization. New York: Viking Press, 1960.
- Selltiz, C., et al.. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- Wiles, K. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill and Company Incorporated, 1962.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES,
AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- Annual Report of the Department of Education. St. John's, Newfoundland: Guardian Press, 1960.

Department of Education Newfoundland. Education Regulations (Remuneration of Teachers and Grants to Boards--Amendment), 1959, Section 2, Item (1).

Department of Education Newfoundland. Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report of the Department of Education. Published by Authority of the Minister of Education, 1963.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Education Division. Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools. 1963-1964.

Hanley, P. J. Annual Report--Newfoundland Department of Education. St. John's: Creative Printers, 1964.

Lindstedt, S. A. "The Alberta Teaching Force in 1958-1959--a Summary," Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta, p. 341. Edmonton, Alberta: November, 1959.

Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XV, May, 1964.

Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XVI, May, 1965.

Newfoundland Department of Education Newsletter. XVII, December, 1965.

C. PERIODICALS

Aikenhead, J. D. "Teacher Satisfaction and Discouragement," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, VI (June, 1960), 92-102.

Anderson, L. W. "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, XLVI (May, 1953), 693-698.

Bidwell, Charles E. "The Administrative Role and Satisfaction in Teaching," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXIX (September, 1955), 41-47.

_____. "Some Causes of Conflict and Tensions Among Teachers," Administrator's Notebook, IV (March, 1956).

Blai, Boris, Jr. "An Occupational Study of Job Satisfaction and Needs Satisfaction," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXXII (Summer, 1964), 383-388.

Blocker, C. E., and R. C. Richardson. "Twenty-five Years of Morale Research: a Critical Review," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXVI (January, 1963), 208.

- Bruce, W. C. "Teacher Turnover," The American School Board Journal, CXLIX (November, 1964), 29.
- Butler, T. M. "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, XXXVI (September, 1961), 11-13.
- Charters, W. W. "The Relation of Morale to Turnover Among Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, II (May, 1965), 163-173.
- Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (November, 1951), 126-132.
- Conville, R. S., and S. A. Anderson. "Teacher Turnover in Coles County, Illinois," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII (January, 1956), 10-19.
- Dalton, J. G. "Man Power Problems in Rural Schools," Teachers' College Record, LIX (October, 1957), 14-19.
- Dunn, K. "Do You Know Why Your Teachers Resign?", Overview, II (June, 1961), 30.
- English, J. "Current Methods of Recruiting and Retaining Teachers," Canadian Education, VI (Fall, 1950), 90.
- Fisher, D. D. "Reducing Teacher Turnover," Michigan Educational Journal, XL (January, 1963), 374.
- Friedlander, F. "Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVII (January, 1964), 388-392.
- Griffiths, Daniel E., Samuel Goldman, and Wayne J. McFarland. "Teacher Mobility in New York City," Educational Administration Quarterly, I (Winter, 1965), 15-31.
- Hill, P. W. "How To Secure and Retain Good Teachers," Educational Digest, XXXIV (October, 1958), 8-10.
- Kleinman, L. "A New Dimension in Teacher Selection," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIV (September, 1960), 24-43.
- Loewen, Howard J. (ed.). "Teacher Supply," The Manitoba Teacher, XLIV (September-October, 1965), 3.
- MacKay, D. A. "Should School Be Bureaucratic?", The Canadian Administrator, IV (November, 1964).
- Mathis, C. "The Relationship Between Salary Policies and Teacher Morale," Journal of Educational Psychology, L (December, 1959), 275-279.

- McLaughlin, J., and B. Nicholson. "Why Teachers Quit Teaching," Nation's Schools, LVIII (November, 1959), 60-61.
- Phillips, B. N., E. Bonk, and J. R. Mitchell. "Can We Reduce Teacher Turnover?", Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (April, 1957), 272.
- Reinhardt, E., and E. K. Lawson. "Experienced Teachers View Their Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (January, 1959), 147-152.
- Rettig, S., and B. Pasamanick. "Status and Job Satisfaction of Public School Teachers," School and Society, LXXXVIII (March, 1959), 113-116.
- Rudd, W. G. A., and S. Wiseman. "Sources of Dissatisfaction Among a Group of Teachers," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (November, 1962), 275-291.
- Williams, M. F. "To Attract and Hold Good Teachers," The School Executive, LXXIX (September, 1959), 66-68.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Adamson, A. K. "An Analysis of the Teacher Turnover Problem in Idaho, 1958-1959." Unpublished Master's thesis, Idaho State College, Idaho, 1960.
- Bailey, A. W. "Living Accommodations for Teachers of Grades VII to XII and its Effects on Teacher Supply and Retention in New Brunswick." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1961.
- Francoeur, F. "Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.
- Greene, G. E. "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary School Teachers in the Central Schools of New York State for the Year 1961-1962." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, New York, 1964.
- Hohn, E. G. "A Study of the Causes of Teacher Transfer in a School System." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.
- Keeler, B. T. "The Leadership Behavior of Principals, Staff Morale, and Productivity." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.

- Roebbothan, C. W. "A Study of the Operation of Anglican School Boards in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- Taggart, Andrew W. "A Study of Teacher Turnover in Selected School Districts in King County." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1959-1960.
- Thomas, W. P. "A Study of Factors Associated with the Retention of Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Cuyahoga County, Ohio." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1964.
- Worger, F. E. "An Investigation to Discover the Effectiveness of Teacherages as a Factor in the Retention of Administrative Staff in Centralized Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1958.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Suite 16
9660 82 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
February, 1966

Dear Teacher:

I would like to solicit your help in gathering data for research in the area of teacher mobility in Newfoundland. Statistics show that the percentage of teachers moving within the province annually, exceeds thirty per cent. This situation is considered by many educators to constitute a major problem. Again, many teachers feel that the lack of stable tenure is one of the major unattractive features of the teaching profession in our province. However, it seems quite reasonable to assume that an investigation in the area of teacher mobility might shed some light on some of the underlying causes of this situation. In this respect the purpose of the inclosed questionnaire is aimed at discovering the extent to which certain identified factors contribute to mobility among Newfoundland teachers. You are asked to respond to the items in question, and also to provide certain data which are related to your personal and professional position. You are not expected to sign your name. The aim of this research is to determine causes of mobility among Newfoundland teachers as a group. Data will be analyzed for groups of teachers, not for individuals. Your anonymity is thus guaranteed.

You may wonder how you happen to be selected for participation in this project. Briefly, all certificated teachers, who were teaching in Newfoundland in the school year 1964-1965 and who are teaching in another school in the same province during this school year were eligible. All of the names of teachers meeting these criteria were made available to me through the assistance of Dr. P.J. Warren, Mr. Fred Kirby, and the Superintendents of Education. However, this constituted a number of approximately six hundred and fifty. In an effort to facilitate collection and treatment of data in this research, two hundred of the teachers mentioned above have been randomly selected. It is assumed that the major causes of teacher mobility will turn up in the two hundred replies. I take the liberty of giving you these details in order to illustrate the importance of your response; for it will be treated as representative of the whole population of "mobile teachers".

The enclosed questionnaire is anticipated to take approximately half an hour. Please take the time now to complete all questions and return the completed form in the self-addressed envelope provided. It is extremely important that every questionnaire be completed posthaste and returned promptly. This will enable the research to be completed in the near future.

You may be interested in knowing a little about my background. I attended Memorial University from 1956-1961, following which I taught on Bell Island and Gander for one and three years respectively. Last June I moved to Alberta where I have since been engaged in graduate work in the field of education. I plan to return to Newfoundland to work in the field of education in September of this year.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

TEACHER MOBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA

Directions: Fill in the blank or check the appropriate blank. The inclusion of your name is optional. In any event the information herein given will be treated, along with information from other questionnaires, as grouped data, and will not directly reflect the individual position of the respondent.

1. Your name -----.
2. Your sex: Male -----; Female -----.
3. Your marital status: Single -----; Married -----; Specify any other -----
4. Your present age in years: -----.
5. How many years were you teaching in the school where you last taught? -----
6. What was the number of teachers in the school in which you taught during the last school year? (If you cannot remember the exact number, indicate approximately) -----
7. What is the number of teachers in the school in which you are now teaching? -----
8. What grade or grades did you teach where you were last teaching? (Specify)

9. What grade or grades are you presently teaching? -----
10. How many years of teaching experience have you? -----
11. What is the approximate population of the community in which you last taught?

12. What is the approximate population of the community where you now teach? -----
13. What was your salary in the position in which you were last teaching?
(approximately) -----
14. What is your present salary? (approximately) -----
15. a. Are you at present working towards higher qualifications? Yes ----- No -----
b. If yes, name the qualifications you are seeking. -----
16. Check below to indicate the type of school in which you were last teaching.
----- 1. All grade (K or 1 to 11) ----- 3. Central high (7 to 11)
----- 2. Elementary (K or 1 to 6) ----- 4. Regional high (9 to 11)
----- 5. Others(specify) -----

17. Check below to indicate the type of school in which you are now teaching.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ----- 1. All grade (K or 1 to 11) | ----- 3. Central high (7to 11) |
| ----- 2. Elementary (K or 1 to 6) | ----- 4. Regional high (9 to 11) |
| ----- 5. Others (specify) ----- | |

18. What teaching grade do you hold?

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| ----- 1. Grade I | ----- 3. Grade III | ----- 5. Grade V |
| ----- 2. Grade II | ----- 4. Grade IV | ----- 6. Grade VI |
| ----- 7. Grade VII | | |

19. Check the type of school system in which you last taught.

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ----- 1. Amalgamated | ----- 3. Pentecostal | ----- 5. Salvation Army |
| ----- 2. Anglican | ----- 4. Roman Catholic | ----- 6. United Church |

20. Check the type of school system in which you are now teaching.

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ----- 1. Amalgamated | ----- 3. Pentecostal | ----- 5. Salvation Army |
| ----- 2. Anglican | ----- 4. Roman Catholic | ----- 6. United Church |

21. Check the type of position you held last year.

- 1. Teacher
- 2. Principal
- 3. Vice-principal

22. Check the type of position you hold this year.

- 1. Teacher
- 2. Principal
- 3. Vice-principal

SECTION B

Indicate, by circling the appropriate letter, the extent to which each of the items listed below influenced your movement from the school where you were teaching last year. (Key: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence; N - no influence)

A. Administrative and Supervisory Factors

(The terms administration and supervision used below, refer to the behaviour patterns associated with the principal and/or vice-principal in the school in which you last taught.)

- (1) The administrative official(s) was/were unfriendly and unapproachable...D M S N
- (2) The administrative official(s) failed to offer leadership to help teachers solve their problems D M S N
- (3) The administrative official(s) lacked consideration for staff members. D M S N
- (4) The administrative official(s) sought publicity and praise at the expense of the staff. D M S N
- (5) The administrative official(s) failed to appreciate and praise desirable results produced by staff members. D M S N
- (6) The administrative official(s) was/were unfair, and discriminated against certain staff members. D M S N
- (7) The administrative official(s) failed to support teacher decisions, therefore breaking down staff coherence and co-operation. D M S N
- (8) The administrative official(s) chose to please pupils and parents at the expense of teachers. D M S N
- (9) Consistent adherence to established policies was not maintained by the administration. D M S N
- (10) There were too many classroom visits by administrative official(s). . . D M S N
- (11) General supervision of school activities was too rigid, inflexible, and authoritative. D M S N
- (12) Teachers were reprimanded by the administration in the presence of students. D M S N
- (13) Staff meetings were so controlled by the administration as not to allow for free staff participation. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

- (14) - - - - - D M S N
- (15) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

ARTICLE I

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

SECTION 1. CLAUSE 1. THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by the following Rule, to-wit: All free Persons, male of the age of twenty one, who seven years before the next Election to the House of Representatives have attained the age of seven years, shall be counted as Representatives in every State where they shall be.

- 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.
- 2. No Person shall be a Representative who shall not, when elected, have seven Years residence in the United States, and be seven Years a Citizen thereof, and, when elected, be Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.
- 3. The House of Representatives may determine the Rules and Standards of Election, and the Qualifications of the Electors, and the Time, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Representatives, but no Election shall be held more frequently than once in seven Years, and no Representative shall be chosen for a longer Term than two Years; but no Person shall be chosen for a second Term, until two Years shall have elapsed since the expiration of the first Term.
- 4. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 5. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 6. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 7. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 8. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 9. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 10. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 11. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 12. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 13. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 14. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.
- 15. The House of Representatives may elect and disqualify its Members, and may expel a Member for Misconduct.

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question; To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence;
N - no influence.

B. Community Factors.

(1) The community where I taught last year exerted unreasonable restrictions on the personal, civic, and social lives of teachers. D M S N

(2) Teachers were expected to show special favour to certain children of influential persons and/or groups. D M S N

(3) The community's restriction on free inquiry in the classroom was unreasonable. D M S N

(4) The attitude existed in the community that teaching was an easy and trivial job. D M S N

(5) The attitude existed in the community that teachers were overpaid. . . . D M S N

(6) The community displayed a lack of interest in school affairs. D M S N

(7) The socio-economic status of the community was low. D M S N

(8) The community offered inadequate material support for the school D M S N

(9) The living and housing conditions were unsatisfactory for teachers. . . . D M S N

(10) The community where I taught last year was too isolated. D M S N

(11) The community was too small. D M S N

(12) Entertainment and recreation facilities were inadequate. D M S N

(13) Insufficient health services were available. D M S N

(14) Inadequate educational facilities were available for me and/or my family. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

(15) - - - - - D M S N

(16) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

C. Economic Factors.

(1) The cost of living was too high in the community where I taught last year. D M S N

(2) The cost of rent for living accommodations was too high. D M S N

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question: To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence; N - no influence.

(3) The cost of travelling from the community where I taught last year to larger population centers was too high. D M S N

(4) Teachers' salaries were too low in comparison with other persons in the community. D M S N

(5) The school board did not supplement teachers' incomes. D M S N

(6) There was little or no opportunity of getting a better paying position in my last school. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

(7) - - - - - D M S N

(8) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

D. Personal and Family Factors.

(1) I wished to be closer to the university. D M S N

(2) I desired to broaden my experiences. D M S N

(3) The position offered little opportunity of meeting the opposite sex. D M S N

(4) I wished to be closer to my husband's (wife's) or boyfriend's (girlfriend's) place of employment. D M S N

(5) I just enjoy moving around. D M S N

(6) I wanted to be nearer my home town or place of family residence. . . D M S N

(7) Other members of my family wanted a move. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

(8) - - - - - D M S N

(9) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question: To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M- moderate influence; S - slight influence;
N - no influence.

E. Pupil Factors.

- (1) There was too little relief from pupils during the day. D M S N
- (2) Pupils were difficult to understand and get along with. D M S N
- (3) Pupils were too disrespectful. D M S N
- (4) Discipline was difficult to maintain. D M S N
- (5) Pupils lacked a desire to learn, and had poor attitudes and study habits. D M S N
- (6) There were too many low ability pupils to teach. D M S N
- (7) Pupils were poorly prepared for the class I taught. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

- (8) - - - - - D M S N
- (9) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

F. Religious Factors.

- (1) Teachers were expected to be very active in church activities. . . D M S N
- (2) The community exerted unnecessary restriction on the religious life of the teachers. D M S N
- (3) The teachers were expected to teach religion in the school. D M S N
- (4) The church interfered with the internal operation of the school. . . D M S N
- (5) Participation in and contribution to church activities were over-emphasized in evaluating teacher effectiveness in teaching. D M S N
- (6) There was too much religious prejudice in the community. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

- (7) - - - - - D M S N
- (8) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

The number of variables and constants are indicated in the table below. The number of variables and constants are indicated in the table below. The number of variables and constants are indicated in the table below.

Table 1		Number of variables	Number of constants
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100

Table 2		Number of variables	Number of constants
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question: To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence;
N - no influence.

G. School Board Factors.

- (1) The Board treated teachers unfairly. D M S N
- (2) The Board officials interfered unnecessarily in the internal
operation of the school. D M S N
- (3) The Board was incompetent. D M S N
- (4) Teacher conduct was too closely scrutinized by the Board. D M S N
- (5) The Board made little or no effort to encourage teachers to
remain on its staff. D M S N
- (6) The Board treated teachers as inferior and non-professional
personnel. D M S N
- (7) The Board made little or no effort to provide or arrange for adequate
housing for teachers. D M S N
- (8) The Board was dissatisfied with my work. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

- (9) - - - - - D M S N
- (10) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

H. Training and Professional Factors.

- (1) I was required to teach subjects and/or grades which I was not
trained to teach. D M S N
- (2) At the level I was teaching, too wide a gap existed between the
theory in the university courses and the school practices. D M S N
- (3) The staff lacked interest in professional activities. D M S N
- (4) Professional competence was not respected among staff members. . . . D M S N
- (5) Staff members made little effort to achieve high academic
standards within the school. D M S N
- (6) The school had a poor academic record. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

- (7) - - - - - D M S N

Section 1: General Provisions	
1.1	General Provisions
1.2	Definitions
1.3	Scope of the Agreement
1.4	Term and Termination
1.5	Assignment
1.6	Notices
1.7	Entire Agreement
1.8	Severability
1.9	Force Majeure
1.10	Dispute Resolution
1.11	Amendment
1.12	Waiver
1.13	Counterparts
1.14	Signatures
1.15	Witnesses
1.16	Execution
1.17	Witnesses
1.18	Witnesses
1.19	Witnesses
1.20	Witnesses
1.21	Witnesses
1.22	Witnesses
1.23	Witnesses
1.24	Witnesses
1.25	Witnesses
1.26	Witnesses
1.27	Witnesses
1.28	Witnesses
1.29	Witnesses
1.30	Witnesses
1.31	Witnesses
1.32	Witnesses
1.33	Witnesses
1.34	Witnesses
1.35	Witnesses
1.36	Witnesses
1.37	Witnesses
1.38	Witnesses
1.39	Witnesses
1.40	Witnesses
1.41	Witnesses
1.42	Witnesses
1.43	Witnesses
1.44	Witnesses
1.45	Witnesses
1.46	Witnesses
1.47	Witnesses
1.48	Witnesses
1.49	Witnesses
1.50	Witnesses
1.51	Witnesses
1.52	Witnesses
1.53	Witnesses
1.54	Witnesses
1.55	Witnesses
1.56	Witnesses
1.57	Witnesses
1.58	Witnesses
1.59	Witnesses
1.60	Witnesses
1.61	Witnesses
1.62	Witnesses
1.63	Witnesses
1.64	Witnesses
1.65	Witnesses
1.66	Witnesses
1.67	Witnesses
1.68	Witnesses
1.69	Witnesses
1.70	Witnesses
1.71	Witnesses
1.72	Witnesses
1.73	Witnesses
1.74	Witnesses
1.75	Witnesses
1.76	Witnesses
1.77	Witnesses
1.78	Witnesses
1.79	Witnesses
1.80	Witnesses
1.81	Witnesses
1.82	Witnesses
1.83	Witnesses
1.84	Witnesses
1.85	Witnesses
1.86	Witnesses
1.87	Witnesses
1.88	Witnesses
1.89	Witnesses
1.90	Witnesses
1.91	Witnesses
1.92	Witnesses
1.93	Witnesses
1.94	Witnesses
1.95	Witnesses
1.96	Witnesses
1.97	Witnesses
1.98	Witnesses
1.99	Witnesses
1.100	Witnesses

Section 2: Specific Provisions	
2.1	Specific Provisions
2.2	Specific Provisions
2.3	Specific Provisions
2.4	Specific Provisions
2.5	Specific Provisions
2.6	Specific Provisions
2.7	Specific Provisions
2.8	Specific Provisions
2.9	Specific Provisions
2.10	Specific Provisions
2.11	Specific Provisions
2.12	Specific Provisions
2.13	Specific Provisions
2.14	Specific Provisions
2.15	Specific Provisions
2.16	Specific Provisions
2.17	Specific Provisions
2.18	Specific Provisions
2.19	Specific Provisions
2.20	Specific Provisions
2.21	Specific Provisions
2.22	Specific Provisions
2.23	Specific Provisions
2.24	Specific Provisions
2.25	Specific Provisions
2.26	Specific Provisions
2.27	Specific Provisions
2.28	Specific Provisions
2.29	Specific Provisions
2.30	Specific Provisions
2.31	Specific Provisions
2.32	Specific Provisions
2.33	Specific Provisions
2.34	Specific Provisions
2.35	Specific Provisions
2.36	Specific Provisions
2.37	Specific Provisions
2.38	Specific Provisions
2.39	Specific Provisions
2.40	Specific Provisions
2.41	Specific Provisions
2.42	Specific Provisions
2.43	Specific Provisions
2.44	Specific Provisions
2.45	Specific Provisions
2.46	Specific Provisions
2.47	Specific Provisions
2.48	Specific Provisions
2.49	Specific Provisions
2.50	Specific Provisions
2.51	Specific Provisions
2.52	Specific Provisions
2.53	Specific Provisions
2.54	Specific Provisions
2.55	Specific Provisions
2.56	Specific Provisions
2.57	Specific Provisions
2.58	Specific Provisions
2.59	Specific Provisions
2.60	Specific Provisions
2.61	Specific Provisions
2.62	Specific Provisions
2.63	Specific Provisions
2.64	Specific Provisions
2.65	Specific Provisions
2.66	Specific Provisions
2.67	Specific Provisions
2.68	Specific Provisions
2.69	Specific Provisions
2.70	Specific Provisions
2.71	Specific Provisions
2.72	Specific Provisions
2.73	Specific Provisions
2.74	Specific Provisions
2.75	Specific Provisions
2.76	Specific Provisions
2.77	Specific Provisions
2.78	Specific Provisions
2.79	Specific Provisions
2.80	Specific Provisions
2.81	Specific Provisions
2.82	Specific Provisions
2.83	Specific Provisions
2.84	Specific Provisions
2.85	Specific Provisions
2.86	Specific Provisions
2.87	Specific Provisions
2.88	Specific Provisions
2.89	Specific Provisions
2.90	Specific Provisions
2.91	Specific Provisions
2.92	Specific Provisions
2.93	Specific Provisions
2.94	Specific Provisions
2.95	Specific Provisions
2.96	Specific Provisions
2.97	Specific Provisions
2.98	Specific Provisions
2.99	Specific Provisions
2.100	Specific Provisions

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question: To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence;
N - no influence.

(8) - - - - - D M S N

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)

I. Working Conditions.

- (1) There were too many grades in one class. D M S N
- (2) Large classes made it impossible to give each pupil adequate help and guidance. D M S N
- (3) Too many non-teaching activities such as plays, athletics, clubs, etc. were required. D M S N
- (4) A lack of teaching aids, materials, and equipment existed. D M S N
- (5) Too many P.T.A.'s, staff meetings, workshops, and Teachers' Association meetings were required. D M S N
- (6) Incompatibility which existed between other staff members and myself resulted in unpleasant relationships and occurrences. D M S N
- (7) There were too many class interruptions. D M S N
- (8) The work load was too unevenly distributed among staff members. D M S N
- (9) Sufficient time for planning, preparing, and evaluating teaching activities was lacking. D M S N
- (10) The future outlook for improvement in working conditions was too discouraging. D M S N
- (11) The school building was in poor repair and inadequate. D M S N
- (12) There was lack of, or inadequate, janitorial service. D M S N
- (13) There was lack of, or inadequate clerical assistance with routine clerical duties. D M S N
- (14) Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in developing policies for grouping, promotions, and control of pupils. D M S N
- (15) Teachers had little or no opportunity to participate in program development in the school. D M S N

OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)

(16) - - - - - D M S N

(17) - - - - - D M S N

REMEMBER - As you read each statement, ask yourself this question: To what extent did this factor influence my decision to leave my last teaching position?

KEY: D - decided influence; M - moderate influence; S - slight influence;
N - no influence.

COMMENT (ON ANY ABOVE FACTORS)


CHANGES NECESSARY BEFORE YOU WOULD RETURN TO YOUR FORMER POSITION.

List below the changes which would be necessary before you would consider returning to the position where you were employed last year. Please be specific.

1. - - - - -
2. - - - - -
3. - - - - -
4. - - - - -
5. - - - - -

100-100000
100-100000
100-100000
100-100000

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Yours sincerely,

C. E. J. Smith

Suite 16
9660 - 82 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta

March 10, 1966

Dear Teacher:

I am happy to say that during the past several days I have received many of the questionnaires on the study of teacher mobility in Newfoundland. This is quite encouraging for, as you know, in order for a study in this type of problem area to be of any value in terms of recommendations, a large representative sample of teachers is necessary. However, there are still a number of questionnaires which have not been received. In the event that you have not already completed the questionnaire, would you please take a few minutes to complete it now and return it to me as soon as you can? If you have already taken care of this matter, please accept my sincere thanks.

It may be that you have not yet received your questionnaire, or it may have been misplaced. If this is the case, please let me know immediately and I will forward one.

APPENDIX B
RESULTS FROM STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF HYPOTHESES

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SEX

Number	Group Identification	Male		Female		Obtained 't'	Level of Significance
		\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N		
1.	Administrative	1.28	29	1.40	50	0.636	NS
2.	"	1.66	29	1.50	50	0.723	NS
3.	"	1.55	29	1.34	50	1.024	NS
4.	"	1.21	29	1.10	50	1.029	NS
5.	"	1.34	29	1.24	50	0.679	NS
6.	"	1.31	29	1.26	50	0.335	NS
7.	"	1.66	29	1.34	50	1.714	NS
8.	"	1.48	29	1.32	50	0.832	NS
9.	"	1.62	29	1.30	50	1.791	NS
10.	"	1.03	29	1.06	50	0.493	NS
11.	"	1.28	29	1.26	50	0.103	NS
12.	"	1.21	29	1.16	50	0.314	NS
13.	"	1.48	29	1.28	50	1.064	NS
14.	Community	1.40	63	1.50	60	0.649	NS
15.	"	1.14	63	1.30	60	1.509	NS
16.	"	1.03	63	1.13	60	1.508	NS
17.	"	1.48	63	1.45	60	0.187	NS
18.	"	1.14	63	1.27	60	1.145	NS
19.	"	1.78	63	1.57	60	1.218	NS
20.	"	1.44	63	1.47	60	0.146	NS
21.	"	1.73	63	1.50	60	1.367	NS
22.	"	1.89	63	1.60	60	1.417	NS
23.	"	1.71	63	1.30	60	2.437	.05
24.	"	1.52	63	1.17	60	2.566	.05
25.	"	2.13	63	1.77	60	1.772	NS
26.	"	1.43	63	1.37	60	0.399	NS
27.	"	1.75	63	1.37	60	2.062	.05
28.	Economic	1.78	63	1.37	60	2.262	.05
29.	"	1.79	63	1.33	60	2.545	.05
30.	"	1.70	63	1.47	60	1.289	NS
31.	"	1.43	63	1.17	60	1.969	NS
32.	"	1.46	63	1.13	60	2.651	.01
33.	"	1.63	63	1.27	60	2.220	.05
34.	Personal	1.75	63	1.43	60	1.619	NS
35.	"	2.63	63	2.20	60	1.944	NS
36.	"	1.27	63	1.45	60	1.204	NS
37.	"	1.30	63	1.90	60	3.077	.01
38.	"	1.60	63	1.93	60	1.774	NS
39.	"	1.76	63	1.93	60	0.794	NS
40.	"	1.24	63	1.15	60	0.783	NS
41.	Pupil	1.51	63	1.38	60	0.829	NS
42.	"	1.27	63	1.42	60	1.128	NS
43.	"	1.37	63	1.47	60	0.634	NS

TABLE XXXIII (continued)

Number	Group Identification	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		Obtained 't'	Level of Significance
		<u>X</u>	N	<u>X</u>	N		
44.	Pupil	1.35	63	1.48	60	0.856	NS
45.	"	1.79	63	1.67	60	0.675	NS
46.	"	1.60	63	1.60	60	0.018	NS
47.	"	1.57	63	1.53	60	0.223	NS
48.	Religious	1.41	63	1.33	60	0.520	NS
49.	"	1.25	63	1.13	60	1.212	NS
50.	"	1.27	63	1.15	60	1.077	NS
51.	"	1.43	63	1.12	60	2.385	.05
52.	"	1.44	63	1.13	60	2.327	.05
53.	"	1.22	63	1.08	60	1.560	NS
54.	School Board	1.32	63	1.27	60	0.372	NS
55.	" "	1.27	63	1.20	60	0.591	NS
56.	" "	1.60	63	1.20	60	2.672	.01
57.	" "	1.21	63	1.20	60	0.060	NS
58.	" "	1.76	63	1.33	60	2.483	.05
59.	" "	1.21	63	1.22	60	0.090	NS
60.	" "	1.52	63	1.30	60	1.391	NS
61.	" "	1.11	63	1.00	60	1.587	NS
62.	Training	1.38	63	1.13	60	1.891	NS
63.	"	1.40	63	1.17	60	1.920	NS
64.	"	1.35	63	1.32	60	0.242	NS
65.	"	1.33	63	1.27	60	0.501	NS
66.	"	1.29	63	1.22	60	0.627	NS
67.	"	1.38	63	1.33	60	0.333	NS
68.	Working Conditions	1.75	63	1.63	60	0.554	NS
69.	" "	1.90	63	1.88	60	0.104	NS
70.	" "	1.21	63	1.08	60	1.349	NS
71.	" "	1.95	63	1.68	60	1.429	NS
72.	" "	1.08	63	1.13	60	0.894	NS
73.	" "	1.29	63	1.15	60	1.142	NS
74.	" "	1.16	63	1.10	60	0.635	NS
75.	" "	1.30	63	1.23	60	0.529	NS
76.	" "	1.57	63	1.43	60	0.833	NS
77.	" "	1.78	63	1.52	60	1.356	NS
78.	" "	1.67	63	1.40	60	1.470	NS
79.	" "	1.75	63	1.55	60	1.007	NS
80.	" "	1.54	63	1.03	60	4.000	.001
81.	" "	1.46	63	1.28	60	1.193	NS
82.	" "	1.54	63	1.35	60	1.161	NS

TABLE XXXIV

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Number	Group Identification	Professional Preparation				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
		1 yr. \bar{X}	N	>1 yr. \bar{X}	N		
1.	Administrative	1.38	37	1.33	42	0.11	NS
2.	"	1.51	37	1.59	42	0.17	NS
3.	"	1.13	37	1.57	42	7.54	.01
4.	"	1.05	37	1.22	42	1.38	NS
5.	"	1.18	37	1.43	42	3.03	NS
6.	"	1.18	37	1.38	42	1.56	NS
7.	"	1.30	37	1.59	42	1.82	NS
8.	"	1.19	37	1.45	42	1.45	NS
9.	"	1.25	37	1.57	42	3.03	NS
10.	"	1.16	37	1.02	42	0.65	NS
11.	"	1.22	37	1.31	42	0.71	NS
12.	"	1.03	37	1.21	42	5.32	.05
13.	"	1.11	37	1.57	42	7.38	.01
14.	Community	1.60	57	1.32	66	2.66	NS
15.	"	1.26	57	1.18	66	0.04	NS
16.	"	1.12	57	1.04	66	0.35	NS
17.	"	1.58	57	1.36	66	3.14	NS
18.	"	1.29	57	1.12	66	1.66	NS
19.	"	1.74	57	1.62	66	1.58	NS
20.	"	1.67	57	1.27	66	7.97	.01
21.	"	1.68	57	1.56	66	1.95	NS
22.	"	1.79	57	1.71	66	1.05	NS
23.	"	1.39	57	1.62	66	0.19	NS
24.	"	1.30	57	1.39	66	0.13	NS
25.	"	1.98	57	1.92	66	1.17	NS
26.	"	1.54	57	1.27	66	4.43	.05
27.	"	1.54	57	1.58	66	0.49	NS
28.	Economic	1.51	57	1.64	66	0.05	NS
29.	"	1.46	57	1.66	66	0.03	NS
30.	"	1.53	57	1.64	66	0.01	NS
31.	"	1.28	57	1.32	66	0.30	NS
32.	"	1.26	57	1.33	66	0.28	NS
33.	"	1.35	57	1.55	66	0.10	NS
34.	Personal	1.42	57	1.74	66	1.23	NS
35.	"	2.35	57	2.48	66	0.04	NS
36.	"	1.56	57	1.18	66	5.17	.05
37.	"	1.75	57	1.45	66	0.12	NS
38.	"	1.89	57	1.65	66	0.42	NS
39.	"	1.83	57	1.82	66	0.01	NS
40.	"	1.11	57	1.27	66	1.64	NS
41.	Pupil	1.53	57	1.38	66	2.05	NS
42.	"	1.49	57	1.21	66	3.46	NS

TABLE XXXIV (continued)

Number	Group Identification	Professional Preparation				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
		1 yr. \bar{X}	N	>1 yr. \bar{X}	N		
43.	Pupil	1.54	57	1.30	66	1.86	NS
44.	"	1.54	57	1.30	66	1.70	NS
45.	"	1.86	57	1.62	66	2.83	NS
46.	"	1.79	57	1.44	66	4.68	.05
47.	"	1.77	57	1.36	66	7.68	.01
48.	Religious	1.33	57	1.41	66	0.10	NS
49.	"	1.14	57	1.24	66	0.34	NS
50.	"	1.19	57	1.23	66	0.02	NS
51.	"	1.12	57	1.41	66	1.82	NS
52.	"	1.14	57	1.42	66	1.70	NS
53.	"	1.14	57	1.17	66	0.12	NS
54.	School Board	1.25	57	1.33	66	0.29	NS
55.	" "	1.19	57	1.27	66	0.23	NS
56.	" "	1.30	57	1.50	66	0.10	NS
57.	" "	1.23	57	1.18	66	0.25	NS
58.	" "	1.46	57	1.64	66	0.01	NS
59.	" "	1.19	57	1.23	66	0.13	NS
60.	" "	1.42	57	1.41	66	0.47	NS
61.	" "	1.02	57	1.09	66	0.20	NS
62.	Training	1.25	57	1.27	66	0.35	NS
63.	"	1.33	57	1.24	66	2.79	NS
64.	"	1.37	57	1.30	66	0.40	NS
65.	"	1.26	57	1.33	66	0.13	NS
66.	"	1.21	57	1.29	66	0.24	NS
67.	"	1.51	57	1.23	66	5.40	.05
68.	Working Conditions	2.11	57	1.23	66	22.44	.0001
69.	" "	2.16	57	1.67	66	7.33	.01
70.	" "	1.05	57	1.22	66	2.27	NS
71.	" "	1.95	57	1.71	66	4.01	.05
72.	" "	1.14	57	1.07	66	0.60	NS
73.	" "	1.19	57	1.24	66	0.01	NS
74.	" "	1.11	57	1.15	66	0.07	NS
75.	" "	1.09	57	1.42	66	7.13	.01
76.	" "	1.56	57	1.45	66	1.13	NS
77.	" "	1.67	57	1.64	66	0.57	NS
78.	" "	1.54	57	1.53	66	0.51	NS
79.	" "	1.70	57	1.61	66	0.94	NS
80.	" "	1.14	57	1.42	66	0.49	NS
81.	" "	1.36	57	1.37	66	0.19	NS
82.	" "	1.35	57	1.53	66	0.47	NS

^a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by professional preparation with sex covaried.

TABLE XXXV

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

No.	Group Identification	Teaching Experience				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
		1-3 yrs. \bar{X}	N	>3 yrs. \bar{X}	N		
1.	Administrative	1.68	31	1.15	48	11.03	.01
2.	"	1.90	31	1.35	48	7.35	.01
3.	"	1.55	31	1.33	48	3.16	NS
4.	"	1.16	31	1.13	48	0.64	NS
5.	"	1.35	31	1.23	48	1.26	NS
6.	"	1.35	31	1.25	48	0.98	NS
7.	"	1.65	31	1.33	48	5.90	.05
8.	"	1.52	31	1.29	48	2.54	NS
9.	"	1.55	31	1.33	48	2.74	NS
10.	"	1.13	31	1.00	48	7.89	.01
11.	"	1.26	31	1.27	48	0.01	NS
12.	"	1.23	31	1.15	48	1.10	NS
13.	"	1.39	31	1.33	48	1.56	NS
14.	Community	1.61	41	1.37	82	1.31	NS
15.	"	1.46	41	1.10	82	10.96	.01
16.	"	1.17	41	1.03	82	2.83	NS
17.	"	1.63	41	1.38	82	2.42	NS
18.	"	1.32	41	1.15	82	1.82	NS
19.	"	1.73	41	1.65	82	0.11	NS
20.	"	1.61	41	1.38	82	1.29	NS
21.	"	1.71	41	1.57	82	0.38	NS
22.	"	1.63	41	1.80	82	0.62	NS
23.	"	1.44	41	1.55	82	0.24	NS
24.	"	1.51	41	1.27	82	3.30	NS
25.	"	2.24	41	1.80	82	4.40	.05
26.	"	1.61	41	1.29	82	3.24	NS
27.	"	1.54	41	1.57	82	0.03	NS
28.	Economic	1.37	41	1.68	82	1.85	NS
29.	"	1.34	41	1.68	82	1.80	NS
30.	"	1.54	41	1.61	82	0.10	NS
31.	"	1.32	41	1.29	82	0.17	NS
32.	"	1.20	41	1.35	82	0.87	NS
33.	"	1.49	41	1.44	82	0.29	NS
34.	Personal	1.32	41	1.73	82	3.11	NS
35.	"	2.38	41	2.19	82	9.81	.01
36.	"	1.51	41	1.28	82	1.29	NS
37.	"	1.71	41	1.54	82	0.23	NS
38.	"	2.07	41	1.61	82	4.46	.05
39.	"	1.98	41	1.78	82	0.54	NS
40.	"	1.02	41	1.28	82	4.13	.05
41.	Pupil	1.66	41	1.34	82	4.29	.05
42.	"	1.49	41	1.27	82	1.68	NS

TABLE XXXV (continued)

No.	Group Identification	<u>Teaching Experience</u>				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
		1-3 yrs. \bar{X}	N	>3 yrs. \bar{X}	N		
43.	Pupil	1.73	41	1.26	82	7.37	.01
44.	"	1.71	41	1.27	82	6.39	.05
45.	"	1.93	41	1.63	82	1.80	NS
46.	"	1.90	41	1.45	82	4.94	.05
47.	"	1.85	41	1.40	82	5.40	.05
48.	Religious	1.56	41	1.28	82	3.03	NS
49.	"	1.29	41	1.14	82	2.28	NS
50.	"	1.29	41	1.17	82	0.97	NS
51.	"	1.32	41	1.26	82	0.69	NS
52.	"	1.39	41	1.24	82	1.68	NS
53.	"	1.15	41	1.16	82	0.01	NS
54.	School Board	1.39	41	1.24	82	1.03	NS
55.	" "	1.27	41	1.22	82	0.23	NS
56.	" "	1.44	41	1.39	82	0.33	NS
57.	" "	1.22	41	1.20	82	0.02	NS
58.	" "	1.56	41	1.55	82	0.08	NS
59.	" "	1.24	41	1.20	82	0.22	NS
60.	" "	1.24	41	1.50	82	2.04	NS
61.	" "	1.07	41	1.05	82	0.27	NS
62.	Training	1.32	41	1.23	82	0.58	NS
63.	"	1.37	41	1.24	82	0.96	NS
64.	"	1.44	41	1.28	82	1.33	NS
65.	"	1.34	41	1.28	82	0.35	NS
66.	"	1.22	41	1.27	82	0.16	NS
67.	"	1.56	41	1.26	82	3.32	NS
68.	Working Conditions	1.98	41	1.55	82	2.83	NS
69.	" "	2.27	41	1.71	82	5.70	.05
70.	" "	1.15	41	1.15	82	0.00	NS
71.	" "	1.95	41	1.75	82	0.64	NS
72.	" "	1.17	41	1.07	82	1.75	NS
73.	" "	1.29	41	1.18	82	1.07	NS
74.	" "	1.17	41	1.11	82	0.49	NS
75.	" "	1.32	41	1.24	82	0.78	NS
76.	" "	1.59	41	1.46	82	0.52	NS
77.	" "	1.83	41	1.56	82	2.01	NS
78.	" "	1.56	41	1.52	82	0.02	NS
79.	" "	1.59	41	1.68	82	0.42	NS
80.	" "	1.39	41	1.24	82	2.86	NS
81.	" "	1.73	41	1.20	82	14.34	.001
82.	" "	1.78	41	1.23	82	11.09	.01

a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by teaching experience with sex and professional preparation covaried.

TABLE XXXVI

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES AMONG FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Number	<u>Amal.</u> ^a		<u>Ang.</u>		<u>R.C.</u>		<u>U.C.</u>		Adj. ^b F	Level of Significance
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N		
1.	1.60	20	1.18	17	1.42	26	1.00	12	1.60	NS
2.	1.55	20	1.65	17	1.58	26	1.25	12	0.93	NS
3.	1.65	20	1.41	17	1.46	26	1.08	12	1.03	NS
4.	1.20	20	1.00	17	1.19	26	1.17	12	1.38	NS
5.	1.25	20	1.29	17	1.35	26	1.17	12	0.04	NS
6.	1.40	20	1.29	17	1.31	26	1.00	12	1.02	NS
7.	1.55	20	1.29	17	1.62	26	1.17	12	2.27	NS
8.	1.30	20	1.47	17	1.50	26	1.25	12	0.34	NS
9.	1.55	20	1.41	17	1.42	26	1.17	12	0.60	NS
10.	1.05	20	1.00	17	1.04	26	1.08	12	0.50	NS
11.	1.30	20	1.06	17	1.46	26	1.08	12	1.11	NS
12.	1.00	20	1.24	17	1.27	26	1.25	12	1.15	NS
13.	1.50	20	1.12	17	1.54	26	1.08	12	1.29	NS
14.	1.13	23	1.39	36	1.84	38	1.25	20	3.40	.05
15.	1.13	23	1.11	36	1.37	38	1.20	20	1.11	NS
16.	1.13	23	1.03	36	1.13	38	1.05	20	0.57	NS
17.	1.39	23	1.44	36	1.61	38	1.30	20	0.84	NS
18.	1.22	23	1.17	36	1.24	38	1.25	20	0.24	NS
19.	1.43	23	1.75	36	1.78	38	1.55	20	0.66	NS
20.	1.22	23	1.61	36	1.47	38	1.40	20	0.31	NS
21.	1.35	23	1.81	36	1.66	38	1.40	20	1.13	NS
22.	1.91	23	1.97	36	1.58	38	1.65	20	1.00	NS
23.	1.30	23	1.61	36	1.50	38	1.55	20	0.28	NS
24.	1.13	23	1.44	36	1.34	38	1.45	20	0.03	NS
25.	1.57	23	1.92	36	2.08	38	2.10	20	0.68	NS
26.	1.17	23	1.33	36	1.63	38	1.25	20	1.77	NS
27.	1.17	23	1.64	36	1.84	38	1.25	20	2.77	.05
28.	2.09	23	1.61	36	1.42	38	1.35	20	1.62	NS
29.	2.17	23	1.50	36	1.45	38	1.20	20	3.48	.05
30.	1.43	23	1.61	36	1.74	38	1.35	20	0.89	NS
31.	1.39	23	1.14	36	1.45	38	1.30	20	1.35	NS
32.	1.39	23	1.19	36	1.39	38	1.30	20	1.5w	NS
33.	1.52	23	1.28	36	1.61	38	1.55	20	1.13	NS
34.	1.26	23	1.50	36	2.08	38	1.35	20	4.89	.01
35.	1.87	23	2.36	36	2.84	38	2.45	20	3.45	.05
36.	1.43	23	1.16	36	1.42	38	1.50	20	0.93	NS
37.	1.52	23	1.61	36	1.68	38	1.50	20	0.08	NS
38.	1.57	23	1.61	36	2.08	38	1.65	20	1.47	NS
39.	1.83	23	2.03	36	1.81	38	1.45	20	1.05	NS
40.	1.13	23	1.25	36	1.16	38	1.05	20	0.59	NS
41.	1.30	23	1.47	36	1.53	38	1.30	20	0.93	NS
42.	1.26	23	1.31	36	1.42	38	1.20	20	0.31	NS

TABLE XXXVI (continued)

Number	<u>Amal.</u>		<u>Ang.</u>		<u>R.C.</u>		<u>U.C.</u>		Adj. ^b F	Level of Significance
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N		
43.	1.57	23	1.31	36	1.37	38	1.30	20	0.39	NS
44.	1.35	23	1.31	36	1.50	38	1.20	20	0.51	NS
45.	1.74	23	1.81	36	1.71	38	1.50	20	0.44	NS
46.	1.87	23	1.50	36	1.61	38	1.35	20	2.18	NS
47.	1.65	23	1.50	36	1.55	38	1.40	20	1.30	NS
48.	1.26	23	1.44	36	1.23	38	1.45	20	0.48	NS
49.	1.22	23	1.22	36	1.16	38	1.15	20	0.14	NS
50.	1.13	23	1.22	36	1.21	38	1.35	20	0.30	NS
51.	1.22	23	1.28	36	1.32	38	1.30	20	0.29	NS
52.	1.26	23	1.39	36	1.16	38	1.30	20	0.35	NS
53.	1.26	23	1.22	36	1.05	38	1.10	20	1.35	NS
54.	1.35	23	1.19	36	1.37	38	1.20	20	0.54	NS
55.	1.08	23	1.26	36	1.26	38	1.25	20	1.77	NS
56.	1.48	23	1.47	36	1.29	38	1.30	20	0.82	NS
57.	1.26	23	1.05	36	1.32	38	1.25	20	1.57	NS
58.	1.78	23	1.50	36	1.66	38	1.30	20	2.99	NS
59.	1.35	23	1.22	36	1.24	38	1.05	20	0.64	NS
60.	1.61	23	1.61	36	1.31	38	1.15	20	1.95	NS
61.	1.04	23	1.08	36	1.00	38	1.00	20	0.61	NS
62.	1.22	23	1.28	36	1.29	38	1.25	20	0.11	NS
63.	1.09	23	1.42	36	1.32	38	1.30	20	0.76	NS
64.	1.30	23	1.31	36	1.37	38	1.25	20	0.28	NS
65.	1.35	23	1.25	36	1.39	38	1.10	20	1.48	NS
66.	1.26	23	1.28	36	1.34	38	1.05	20	1.29	NS
67.	1.39	23	1.33	36	1.34	38	1.35	20	0.50	NS
68.	1.22	23	1.58	36	1.79	38	2.10	20	1.52	NS
69.	1.48	23	1.89	36	2.03	38	2.15	20	0.35	NS
70.	1.00	23	1.22	36	1.18	38	1.15	20	1.40	NS
71.	1.39	23	1.94	36	1.97	38	1.75	20	1.02	NS
72.	1.13	23	1.11	36	1.05	38	1.15	20	0.71	NS
73.	1.26	23	1.11	36	1.45	38	1.00	20	3.70	.05
74.	1.00	23	1.11	36	1.24	38	1.15	20	0.93	NS
75.	1.57	23	1.19	36	1.32	38	1.00	20	2.44	NS
76.	1.52	23	1.39	36	1.34	38	1.90	20	1.79	NS
77.	1.57	23	1.64	36	1.74	38	1.50	20	0.65	NS
78.	1.22	23	1.78	36	1.55	38	1.45	20	0.80	NS
79.	1.17	23	1.81	36	1.89	38	1.50	20	1.31	NS
80.	1.22	23	1.42	36	1.11	38	1.60	20	1.02	NS
81.	1.57	23	1.25	36	1.32	38	1.45	20	1.25	NS
82.	1.61	23	1.33	36	1.53	38	1.40	20	0.65	NS

a

Amal. Amalgamated; Ang. Anglican; R.C. Roman Catholic;
U.C. United Church

b.

Adjusted F ratio resulting from an analysis of covariance by
school systems with sex, school size, and community population covaried.

TABLE XXXVII

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL SIZE^a

Number	Group Identification	Number of Teachers				Obtained 't'	Level of Significance
		1-9 \bar{X}	N	>9 \bar{X}	N		
1.	Administrative	1.36	42	1.35	37	0.031	NS
2.	"	1.67	42	1.43	37	1.136	NS
3.	"	1.29	42	1.57	37	1.420	NS
4.	"	1.12	42	1.16	37	0.427	NS
5.	"	1.19	42	1.38	37	1.270	NS
6.	"	1.12	42	1.46	37	2.435	.05
7.	"	1.40	42	1.51	37	0.602	NS
8.	"	1.38	42	1.38	37	0.014	NS
9.	"	1.36	42	1.49	37	0.735	NS
10.	"	1.07	42	1.03	37	0.891	NS
11.	"	1.17	42	1.38	37	1.445	NS
12.	"	1.17	42	1.19	37	0.156	NS
13.	"	1.12	42	1.62	37	2.850	.01
14.	Community	1.54	83	1.20	40	2.073	.05
15.	"	1.22	83	1.20	40	0.151	NS
16.	"	1.08	83	1.07	40	0.129	NS
17.	"	1.52	83	1.32	40	1.324	NS
18.	"	1.25	83	1.20	40	0.420	NS
19.	"	1.84	83	1.40	40	2.388	.05
20.	"	1.55	83	1.20	40	2.251	.05
21.	"	1.71	83	1.35	40	2.081	.05
22.	"	1.75	83	1.72	40	0.100	NS
23.	"	1.48	83	1.40	40	0.438	NS
24.	"	1.45	83	1.05	40	2.554	.05
25.	"	2.04	83	1.57	40	2.079	.05
26.	"	1.46	83	1.10	40	2.203	.05
27.	"	1.59	83	1.38	40	1.050	NS
28.	Economic	1.27	83	2.13	40	4.552	.001
29.	"	1.31	83	1.95	40	3.271	.01
30.	"	1.53	83	1.50	40	0.154	NS
31.	"	1.16	83	1.50	40	2.329	.05
32.	"	1.31	83	1.17	40	0.975	NS
33.	"	1.39	83	1.50	40	0.614	NS
34.	Personal	1.41	83	1.80	40	1.882	NS
35.	"	2.34	83	2.38	40	0.149	NS
36.	"	1.31	83	1.35	40	0.220	NS
37.	"	1.48	83	1.65	40	0.774	NS
38.	"	1.73	83	1.65	40	0.414	NS
39.	"	1.70	83	2.00	40	1.278	NS
40.	"	1.19	83	1.10	40	0.732	NS
41.	Pupil	1.55	83	1.25	40	1.920	NS
42.	"	1.39	83	1.27	40	0.792	NS
43.	"	1.43	83	1.50	40	0.378	NS
44.	"	1.40	83	1.45	40	0.313	NS

TABLE XXXVII (continued)

Number	Group Identification	Number of Teachers				Obtained 't'	Level of Significance
		1-9	\bar{X}	N	>9	\bar{X}	N
45.	Pupil	1.78	83	1.57	40	1.052	NS
46.	"	1.73	83	1.47	40	1.333	NS
47.	"	1.71	83	1.38	40	1.810	NS
48.	Religious	1.43	83	1.27	40	0.965	NS
49.	"	1.25	83	1.17	40	0.661	NS
50.	"	1.30	83	1.22	40	0.560	NS
51.	"	1.41	83	1.17	40	1.447	NS
52.	"	1.43	83	1.20	40	1.318	NS
53.	"	1.18	83	1.15	40	0.313	NS
54.	School Board	1.36	83	1.32	40	0.220	NS
55.	" "	1.30	83	1.22	40	0.526	NS
56.	" "	1.55	83	1.25	40	1.793	NS
57.	" "	1.31	83	1.17	40	0.934	NS
58.	" "	1.67	83	1.42	40	1.314	NS
59.	" "	1.17	83	1.30	40	1.063	NS
60.	" "	1.37	83	1.40	40	0.148	NS
61.	" "	1.04	83	1.00	40	0.432	NS
62.	Training	1.33	83	1.17	40	1.042	NS
63.	"	1.31	83	1.22	40	0.681	NS
64.	"	1.36	83	1.22	40	0.974	NS
65.	"	1.36	83	1.17	40	1.322	NS
66.	"	1.27	83	1.22	40	0.341	NS
67.	"	1.42	83	1.22	40	1.296	NS
68.	Working Conditions	1.99	83	1.05	40	4.722	.001
69.	" "	2.05	83	1.57	40	2.196	.05
70.	" "	1.12	83	1.22	40	1.060	NS
71.	" "	1.94	83	1.47	40	2.379	.05
72.	" "	1.10	83	1.13	40	0.443	NS
73.	" "	1.22	83	1.13	40	0.687	NS
74.	" "	1.16	83	1.13	40	0.304	NS
75.	" "	1.27	83	1.30	40	0.252	NS
76.	" "	1.59	83	1.32	40	1.510	NS
77.	" "	1.84	83	1.27	40	2.817	.01
78.	" "	1.58	83	1.35	40	1.205	NS
79.	" "	1.81	83	1.25	40	2.810	.01
80.	" "	1.39	83	1.15	40	1.623	NS
81.	" "	1.42	83	1.35	40	0.433	NS
82.	" "	1.41	83	1.55	40	0.802	NS

* The number of teachers is used as an index of school size.

TABLE XXXVIII

TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR MEANS OF RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY POPULATION

Number	Group Identification	Population				Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance
		<1000 \bar{X}	N	$\geq 1000 \bar{X}$	N		
1.	Administrative	1.56	18	1.31	58	1.44	NS
2.	"	1.89	18	1.43	58	2.67	NS
3.	"	1.61	18	1.38	58	2.89	NS
4.	"	1.22	18	1.12	58	0.96	NS
5.	"	1.39	18	1.26	58	1.85	NS
6.	"	1.17	18	1.33	58	0.53	NS
7.	"	1.56	18	1.41	58	0.60	NS
8.	"	1.83	18	1.26	58	7.32	.01
9.	"	1.56	18	1.36	58	0.97	NS
10.	"	1.06	18	1.05	58	0.12	NS
11.	"	1.17	18	1.31	58	1.29	NS
12.	"	1.39	18	1.12	58	3.23	NS
13.	"	1.17	18	1.43	58	1.88	NS
14.	Community	1.82	47	1.20	72	8.87	.01
15.	"	1.36	47	1.13	72	6.27	.05
16.	"	1.15	47	1.04	72	3.58	NS
17.	"	1.70	47	1.32	72	3.97	.05
18.	"	1.30	47	1.15	72	1.90	NS
19.	"	2.00	47	1.50	72	1.58	NS
20.	"	1.72	47	1.31	72	1.77	NS
21.	"	1.96	47	1.43	72	1.92	NS
22.	"	1.96	47	1.65	72	0.57	NS
23.	"	1.72	47	1.39	72	1.99	NS
24.	"	1.70	47	1.14	72	5.84	.05
25.	"	2.43	47	1.63	72	7.31	.01
26.	"	1.83	47	1.14	72	12.10	.001
27.	"	1.91	47	1.33	72	4.80	.05
28.	Economic	1.49	47	1.64	72	0.11	NS
29.	"	1.55	47	1.58	72	0.62	NS
30.	"	1.70	47	1.51	72	0.62	NS
31.	"	1.19	47	1.39	72	0.32	NS
32.	"	1.40	47	1.25	72	1.62	NS
33.	"	1.57	47	1.40	72	1.82	NS
34.	Personal	1.64	47	1.60	72	0.92	NS
35.	"	2.57	47	2.33	72	0.26	NS
36.	"	1.34	47	1.33	72	0.09	NS
37.	"	1.60	47	1.58	72	0.23	NS
38.	"	1.64	47	1.83	72	2.30	NS
39.	"	1.91	47	1.81	72	0.96	NS
40.	"	1.23	47	1.18	72	0.01	NS
41.	Pupil	1.53	47	1.42	72	0.10	NS
42.	"	1.40	47	1.32	72	0.28	NS

TABLE XXXVIII (continued)

Number	Group Identification	Population		N	Adj. F ^a	Level of Significance	
		<1000 \bar{X}	N \geq 1000 \bar{X}				
43.	Pupil	1.38	47	1.44	72	0.01	NS
44.	"	1.36	47	1.46	72	0.01	NS
45.	"	2.03	47	1.57	72	3.50	NS
46.	"	1.85	47	1.47	72	2.62	NS
47.	"	1.83	47	1.40	72	1.73	NS
48.	Religious	1.40	47	1.33	72	0.01	NS
49.	"	1.21	47	1.19	72	0.00	NS
50.	"	1.21	47	1.22	72	0.22	NS
51.	"	1.32	47	1.26	72	0.47	NS
52.	"	1.36	47	1.22	72	0.22	NS
53.	"	1.26	47	1.10	72	1.24	NS
54.	School Board	1.36	47	1.22	72	1.37	NS
55.	" "	1.26	47	1.24	72	0.01	NS
56.	" "	1.55	47	1.29	72	0.38	NS
57.	" "	1.30	47	1.15	72	1.71	NS
58.	" "	1.89	47	1.36	72	4.40	.05
59.	" "	1.17	47	1.25	72	0.11	NS
60.	" "	1.53	47	1.36	72	0.24	NS
61.	" "	1.09	47	1.00	72	0.87	NS
62.	Training	1.43	47	1.17	72	2.57	NS
63.	"	1.40	47	1.22	72	0.47	NS
64.	"	1.47	47	1.26	72	0.76	NS
65.	"	1.40	47	1.25	72	0.10	NS
66.	"	1.34	47	1.21	72	0.33	NS
67.	"	1.64	47	1.19	72	4.75	.05
68.	Working Conditions	2.21	47	1.36	72	3.43	NS
69.	" "	2.25	47	1.70	72	2.23	NS
70.	" "	1.21	47	1.11	72	3.55	NS
71.	" "	2.25	47	1.55	72	3.40	NS
72.	" "	1.10	47	1.10	72	0.01	NS
73.	" "	1.36	47	1.14	72	1.90	NS
74.	" "	1.21	47	1.08	72	1.22	NS
75.	" "	1.32	47	1.25	72	0.92	NS
76.	" "	1.62	47	1.46	72	0.10	NS
77.	" "	1.98	47	1.43	72	2.91	NS
78.	" "	1.87	47	1.33	72	2.88	NS
79.	" "	2.09	47	1.39	72	3.16	NS
80.	" "	1.45	47	1.20	72	0.32	NS
81.	" "	1.51	47	1.31	72	1.37	NS
82.	" "	1.60	47	1.38	72	3.26	NS

a

Adjusted F ratio resulting from analysis of covariance by population with sex and school size covaried.

B29855